

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, April 24, 1995
Volume 31—Number 16
Pages 631–683

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings
Bombing in Oklahoma City, OK—662, 673, 678
Brazil, visit of President Cardoso
 State dinner—672
 Welcoming ceremony—664
Maryland, Earth Day, 25th anniversary in
 Havre de Grace—674
Radio address—631
White House Easter egg roll—632

Bill Signings

District of Columbia Financial Responsibility
and Management Assistance Act of 1995,
remarks—632

Communications to Federal Agencies

Employees affected by the Oklahoma City
bombing, memorandum—672

Executive Orders

Classified National Security Information—634

Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters
 Briefing Room—678
 Oval Office—659
 South Lawn—673
News conferences
 April 18 (No. 93)—651
 April 20 (No. 94) with President Cardoso of
 Brazil—665

Letters and Messages

Disaster assistance for Oklahoma City, OK,
letters—663

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Brazil, President Cardoso—664, 665, 673
Turkey, Prime Minister Ciller—659

Proclamations

Jewish Heritage Week—671
National D.A.R.E. Day—671
National Day of Mourning in Memory of
 Those Who Died in Oklahoma City—681
National Volunteer Week—681
Victims of the Oklahoma Bombing—670

Statements by the President

Air Force C-21 crash in Alabama—651
Executive order on classified national security
information—633
Presidential Medal of Freedom,
 announcement of award to Gaylord
 Nelson—680
Reform of regulations implementing the
 Community Reinvestment Act—662
Senator David Pryor's decision not to seek
reelection—680

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—683
Checklist of White House press releases—683
Digest of other White House
 announcements—682
Nominations submitted to the Senate—683

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, April 21, 1995

The President's Radio Address

April 15, 1995

Good morning. This weekend, all across our country, Christians and Jews are gathered with their families to celebrate Easter and Passover. For them and for every American, Hillary and I wish that this season of faith and renewal will also be a time of hope.

In a few weeks, Congress will return from their own Easter recess and begin to sift through all the bills passed by the House and, in some cases, those passed by the Senate, too. A lot of that work is good. A lot of it I campaigned on in 1992: spending cuts, the line-item veto, paperwork reduction, tougher criminal sentences, and greater flexibility for the police to do their jobs. These things are also consistent with actions already taken by our administration to cut the deficit, the size of Government, the burden of regulation, to tighten enforcement on child support and college loan repayments, and to give more support to Head Start and affordable college loans, national service, and family leave.

But a lot of these proposals, these new ones, go too far: cuts in education and job training, undermining environmental protections, undermining our efforts to put 100,000 new police on our streets, legislation to permit the sale of assault weapons, and penalties for going into court to assert your rights as a citizen. I'm concerned that important issues will be lost in all the welter of detailed legislative proposals Congress has to consider. So I want to tell Congress and the American people what my priorities are.

There are three areas that I assign the highest priority. They're my "must" list. First is welfare reform. We must pass a bill that reforms the welfare system and restores mainstream values of work and family, responsibility and community. We must demand work and responsibility by setting definite time limits for welfare recipients and enforcing strict work requirements. We must

promote family and responsibility by passing the toughest possible child support enforcement, including our plan to deny driver's licenses to parents who refuse to pay their child support.

We must also give the States more flexibility, building on the work I've already done by giving States freedom, 25 of them, from Federal rules so they can find new ways to move people from welfare to work. At the same time, we have to uphold our values of community and responsibility by avoiding proposals that punish children for their parents' mistakes.

Recent proposals by a number of Senators for welfare reform that don't penalize children born to teenage mothers are certainly a step in the right direction. And the House of Representatives has adopted all my proposals for tougher child support enforcement. I appreciate these efforts. We have to keep on working, however. All the proposals are still too weak on work and on helping people to move from welfare to work. We can and must work together to pass a welfare reform bill that I can sign into law this year. Delaying reform any further would be a betrayal of what the American people want.

Second on my "must" list are tax and spending cuts, the right kind in the right amount for the right people. These tax cuts must be directed at the right people, that is, the middle class Americans who need them to help them build a successful future. And they must be fully paid for by spending cuts. Tax cuts must include a deduction for the cost of college or other education after high school.

Then Congress and I need to work together to go beyond the \$600 billion of deficit reduction we've already enacted. And I've already proposed another \$80 billion in cuts on top of paying for all the tax cuts that I have proposed for the cost of education after high school for helping people with raising children and for an IRA which can be with-

drawn from tax free for the cost of education or health care, first-time home buying or caring for an elderly parent.

We've also worked with Congress on \$15 billion of further cuts. And I am ready to do more. But we have to focus on our twin deficits—we have a budget deficit and an education deficit. And we cannot cut one at the expense of the other.

The third thing I want to do is to build on last year's crime bill, not tear it down. We should all be open to new proposals for tougher penalties and more support for our police, but they must not be a cover for cutting back on our commitment for 100,000 new police officers on our street or for repealing the assault weapons ban that would put our police and our citizens more at risk. If that happens, I'll veto it.

More police on the street is the single most effective crime-fighting tool we know of. And assault weapons have no place on our streets. Last year's bill did ban assault weapons in the future, 19 of them, whose only purpose is to kill people. But it also for the first time gave legal protection from Government meddling to over 650 kinds of hunting and sporting weapons.

Congress must send me a bill that doesn't scale back or repeal the efforts so I can sign it and it can become law. There is too much to do in crime to play politics with it or to go back.

Real welfare reform, tax and spending cuts that reduce both the budget deficit and the education deficit, and more steps to fight crime, not to back up on the fight: those are my top priorities. The first 100 days of this Congress produced a blizzard of ideas and proposals. The next 100 days must get down to the hard task of passing bills that command majorities in both Houses, bills that will help to build a stronger America, bills that I can sign into law.

In the coming months, we have an historic chance to make progress on the issues of great concern to all Americans. Let's get on with it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4 p.m. on April 13 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 15.

Remarks at the White House Easter Egg Roll

April 17, 1995

The President. Thank you. First let me welcome all the children here and all the people like me who feel like children when they're at the Egg Roll.

I want to thank all of you who helped to make this event possible and remind you that this has been going on here at the White House now for more than 115 years. This is one of the most important traditions we have at the White House. It's really a day for children; it's a day for joy; it's a day for gratitude. And we're all very, very happy and proud to have you here.

Now, I don't want to delay the roll any further, so I think—Bernie is supposed to come up and give me the whistle after the rabbit gives me the jelly bean carrot. [*Laughter*] I want you kids to eat your real carrots, too. [*Laughter*]

This is—this gentleman that's giving me the whistle, he's been doing this for 9 years now. Let's give him a big hand. This is Bernie Fairbanks. [*Applause*]

Where are they? Down there? Can you hear? Are you ready? You count to three for me.

Audience Members. One, two, three!

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:45 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. Prior to his remarks, Hillary Clinton welcomed the participants to the annual White House Easter Egg Roll and introduced the President.

Remarks on Signing the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995

April 17, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you, Alice Rivlin, for your hard work on this issue and for being such a devoted resident of the District of Columbia. I told somebody in the Oval Office before we came out here that, unlike a lot of us who are transients, Alice Rivlin's not going anywhere. [*Laughter*] And she desperately wanted this to be done well.

Congressman Davis, Congressman Clinger, Congresswoman Morella, Congresswoman Norton, Mayor Barry, President Clarke, members of the City Council, and other friends of the District of Columbia, this is a very important day and a very important piece of legislation for all of us who care about our country's Capital and for all of us who love Washington as a city. I have lived here not only as President but also as a college student. I know this to be a city not only of our national monuments and political centers but also a city of neighborhoods, of Shaw and Anacostia and Cleveland Park and Adams Morgan and so many others.

So this is a very important day for a city—a city and thousands and thousands of people who live in it, who love it, who care about it, who have lives, many of them who have nothing to do with the politics of the Nation's Capital, but who deserve to live in a city that works, that functions, and that also can symbolize the very best in America.

The health of the city and the security of its citizens have been threatened by the financial crisis. And I applaud all those who have come together to work together to begin the road back.

The purpose of the bill I am signing today is just that; it is a road back. The Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act will speed the District's recovery and return to fiscal health and will help over the long run to improve the delivery of services to its citizens.

For the past 2 years, I've worked hard to turn the economy of our country around. And we've seen dramatic improvements in the deficit, in the ability of this country to create jobs, and having a Government that is both smaller and more efficient.

But none of that means very much to people whose own lives are troubled with insecurity. And the citizens of the District of Columbia need to know that security, stability, growth, and opportunity will be the hallmarks of their living in our Nation's Capital.

This effort, as Alice Rivlin has said, is proof of what we can accomplish when we work together, when we put the interests of real people first, when we ignore partisan politics, and when we get on with the job at hand.

I want to thank Alice Rivlin, as I said, for all the work that she has been doing. I want to thank the Members of the Congress here present. Congressman Davis, I think when he came to the Congress, never could have imagined that this would be his first big assignment. [Laughter] He is now, I guess, an honorary citizen of Washington, DC. Eleanor Holmes Norton, when she ran for Congress, probably never imagined that this would be one of the most important pieces of legislation which she would have to undertake. But they have worked together in good spirit, in good faith. And I thank them, along with the other Members who are present, and Congressman Walsh, and others, and also the Members of the Senate who worked so expeditiously on this legislation.

The legislation calls for the creation of the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority to monitor and certify District budgets and borrowing, to get the city back on solid financial footing.

I expect to appoint the five members of this Authority very soon. All of them will have a commitment to this city, and all of them will either live or work here.

Our goals are clear. There are tough choices in the short term, but I am confident that this legislation will lead to better services, a more responsive government, to safer streets, and to a stronger city for the citizens of this District. All of them deserve that, and America needs that.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:35 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Marion Barry of the District of Columbia and David Clarke, District of Columbia Council president.

Statement on Signing the Executive Order on Classified National Security Information

April 17, 1995

Today I have signed an Executive order reforming the Government's system of secrecy. The order will lift the veil on millions of existing documents, keep a great many future documents from ever being classified, and still maintain necessary controls over in-

formation that legitimately needs to be guarded in the interests of national security.

In issuing this order, I am seeking to bring the system for classifying, safeguarding, and declassifying national security information into line with our vision of American democracy in the post-Cold War world.

This order strikes an appropriate balance. On the one hand, it will sharply reduce the permitted level of secrecy within our Government, making available to the American people and posterity most documents of permanent historical value that were maintained in secrecy until now.

On the other, the order enables us to safeguard the information that we must hold in confidence to protect our Nation and our citizens. We must continue to protect information that is critical to the pursuit of our national security interests. There are some categories of information—for example, the war plans we may employ or the identities of clandestine human assets—that must remain protected.

This order also will reduce the sizable costs of secrecy—the tangible costs of needlessly guarding documents and the intangible costs of depriving ourselves of the fullest possible flow of information.

This order establishes many firsts: Classifiers will have to justify what they classify; employees will be encouraged and expected to challenge improper classification and protected from retribution for doing so; and large-scale declassification won't be dependent on the availability of individuals to conduct a line-by-line review. Rather, we will automatically declassify hundreds of millions of pages of information that were classified in the past 50 years.

Similarly, we will no longer tolerate the excesses of the current system. For example, we will resolve doubtful calls about classification in favor of keeping the information unclassified. We will not permit the reclassification of information after it has been declassified and disclosed under proper authority. We will authorize agency heads to balance the public interest in disclosure against the national security interest in making declassification decisions. And, we will no longer presumptively classify certain categories of information, whether or not the specific in-

formation otherwise meets the strict standards for classification. At the same time, however, we will maintain every necessary safeguard and procedure to assure that appropriately classified information is fully protected.

Taken together, these reforms will greatly reduce the amount of information that we classify in the first place and the amount that remains classified. Perhaps most important, the reforms will create a classification system that Americans can trust to protect our national security in a reasonable, limited, and cost-effective manner.

In keeping with my goals and commitments, this order was drafted in an unprecedented environment of openness. We held open hearings and benefitted from the recommendations of interested Committees of Congress and nongovernmental organizations, groups, businesses, and individuals. The order I have signed today is stronger because of the advice we received from so many sources. I thank all those who have helped to establish this new system as a model for protecting our national security within the framework of a Government of, by, and for the people.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 17, 1995.

Executive Order 12958—Classified National Security Information

April 17, 1995

This order prescribes a uniform system for classifying, safeguarding, and declassifying national security information. Our democratic principles require that the American people be informed of the activities of their Government. Also, our Nation's progress depends on the free flow of information. Nevertheless, throughout our history, the national interest has required that certain information be maintained in confidence in order to protect our citizens, our democratic institutions, and our participation within the community of nations. Protecting information critical to our Nation's security remains a priority. In recent years, however, dramatic changes have altered, although not eliminated, the

national security threats that we confront. These changes provide a greater opportunity to emphasize our commitment to open Government.

Now, Therefore, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Part 1 Original Classification

Section 1.1. Definitions. For purposes of this order:

(a) "National security" means the national defense or foreign relations of the United States.

(b) "Information" means any knowledge that can be communicated or documentary material, regardless of its physical form or characteristics, that is owned by, produced by or for, or is under the control of the United States Government. "Control" means the authority of the agency that originates information, or its successor in function, to regulate access to the information.

(c) "Classified national security information" (hereafter "classified information") means information that has been determined pursuant to this order or any predecessor order to require protection against unauthorized disclosure and is marked to indicate its classified status when in documentary form.

(d) "Foreign Government Information" means:

(1) information provided to the United States Government by a foreign government or governments, an international organization of governments, or any element thereof, with the expectation that the information, the source of the information, or both, are to be held in confidence;

(2) information produced by the United States pursuant to or as a result of a joint arrangement with a foreign government or governments, or an international organization of governments, or any element thereof, requiring that the information, the arrangement, or both, are to be held in confidence; or

(3) information received and treated as "Foreign Government Information" under the terms of a predecessor order.

(e) "Classification" means the act or process by which information is determined to be classified information.

(f) "Original classification" means an initial determination that information requires, in the interest of national security, protection against unauthorized disclosure.

(g) "Original classification authority" means an individual authorized in writing, either by the President, or by agency heads or other officials designated by the President, to classify information in the first instance.

(h) "Unauthorized disclosure" means a communication or physical transfer of classified information to an unauthorized recipient.

(i) "Agency" means any "Executive agency," as defined in 5 U.S.C. 105, and any other entity within the executive branch that comes into the possession of classified information.

(j) "Senior agency official" means the official designated by the agency head under section 5.6(c) of this order to direct and administer the agency's program under which information is classified, safeguarded, and declassified.

(k) "Confidential source" means any individual or organization that has provided, or that may reasonably be expected to provide, information to the United States on matters pertaining to the national security with the expectation that the information or relationship, or both, are to be held in confidence.

(l) "Damage to the national security" means harm to the national defense or foreign relations of the United States from the unauthorized disclosure of information, to include the sensitivity, value, and utility of that information.

Sec. 1.2. Classification Standards. (a) Information may be originally classified under the terms of this order only if all of the following conditions are met:

(1) an original classification authority is classifying the information;

(2) the information is owned by, produced by or for, or is under the control of the United States Government;

(3) the information falls within one or more of the categories of information listed in section 1.5 of this order; and

(4) the original classification authority determines that the unauthorized dis-

closure of the information reasonably could be expected to result in damage to the national security and the original classification authority is able to identify or describe the damage.

(b) If there is significant doubt about the need to classify information, it shall not be classified. This provision does not:

- (1) amplify or modify the substantive criteria or procedures for classification; or
- (2) create any substantive or procedural rights subject to judicial review.

(c) Classified information shall not be declassified automatically as a result of any unauthorized disclosure of identical or similar information.

Sec. 1.3. Classification Levels. (a) Information may be classified at one of the following three levels:

- (1) "Top Secret" shall be applied to information, the unauthorized disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause exceptionally grave damage to the national security that the original classification authority is able to identify or describe.
- (2) "Secret" shall be applied to information, the unauthorized disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause serious damage to the national security that the original classification authority is able to identify or describe.
- (3) "Confidential" shall be applied to information, the unauthorized disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause damage to the national security that the original classification authority is able to identify or describe.

(b) Except as otherwise provided by statute, no other terms shall be used to identify United States classified information.

(c) If there is significant doubt about the appropriate level of classification, it shall be classified at the lower level.

Sec. 1.4. Classification Authority. (a) The authority to classify information originally may be exercised only by:

- (1) the President;
- (2) agency heads and officials designated by the President in the *Federal Register*; or

(3) United States Government officials delegated this authority pursuant to paragraph (c), below.

(b) Officials authorized to classify information at a specified level are also authorized to classify information at a lower level.

(c) Delegation of original classification authority.

(1) Delegations of original classification authority shall be limited to the minimum required to administer this order. Agency heads are responsible for ensuring that designated subordinate officials have a demonstrable and continuing need to exercise this authority.

(2) "Top Secret" original classification authority may be delegated only by the President or by an agency head or official designated pursuant to paragraph (a)(2), above.

(3) "Secret" or "Confidential" original classification authority may be delegated only by the President; an agency head or official designated pursuant to paragraph (a)(2), above; or the senior agency official, provided that official has been delegated "Top Secret" original classification authority by the agency head.

(4) Each delegation of original classification authority shall be in writing and the authority shall not be redelegated except as provided in this order. Each delegation shall identify the official by name or position title.

(d) Original classification authorities must receive training in original classification as provided in this order and its implementing directives.

(e) Exceptional cases. When an employee, contractor, licensee, certificate holder, or grantee of an agency that does not have original classification authority originates information believed by that person to require classification, the information shall be protected in a manner consistent with this order and its implementing directives. The information shall be transmitted promptly as provided under this order or its implementing directives to the agency that has appropriate subject matter interest and classification authority with respect to this information. That agency shall decide within 30 days whether to classify this information. If it is not clear

which agency has classification responsibility for this information, it shall be sent to the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office. The Director shall determine the agency having primary subject matter interest and forward the information, with appropriate recommendations, to that agency for a classification determination.

Sec. 1.5. Classification Categories.

Information may not be considered for classification unless it concerns:

- (a) military plans, weapons systems, or operations;
- (b) foreign government information;
- (c) intelligence activities (including special activities), intelligence sources or methods, or cryptology;
- (d) foreign relations or foreign activities of the United States, including confidential sources;
- (e) scientific, technological, or economic matters relating to the national security;
- (f) United States Government programs for safeguarding nuclear materials or facilities; or
- (g) vulnerabilities or capabilities of systems, installations, projects or plans relating to the national security.

Sec. 1.6. Duration of Classification. (a) At the time of original classification, the original classification authority shall attempt to establish a specific date or event for declassification based upon the duration of the national security sensitivity of the information. The date or event shall not exceed the time frame in paragraph (b), below.

(b) If the original classification authority cannot determine an earlier specific date or event for declassification, information shall be marked for declassification 10 years from the date of the original decision, except as provided in paragraph (d), below.

(c) An original classification authority may extend the duration of classification or reclassify specific information for successive periods not to exceed 10 years at a time if such action is consistent with the standards and procedures established under this order. This provision does not apply to information contained in records that are more than 25 years old and have been determined to have permanent historical value under title 44, United States Code.

(d) At the time of original classification, the original classification authority may exempt from declassification within 10 years specific information, the unauthorized disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to cause damage to the national security for a period greater than that provided in paragraph (b), above, and the release of which could reasonably be expected to:

- (1) reveal an intelligence source, method, or activity, or a cryptologic system or activity;
- (2) reveal information that would assist in the development or use of weapons of mass destruction;
- (3) reveal information that would impair the development or use of technology within a United States weapons system;
- (4) reveal United States military plans, or national security emergency preparedness plans;
- (5) reveal foreign government information;
- (6) damage relations between the United States and a foreign government, reveal a confidential source, or seriously undermine diplomatic activities that are reasonably expected to be ongoing for a period greater than that provided in paragraph (b), above;
- (7) impair the ability of responsible United States Government officials to protect the President, the Vice President, and other individuals for whom protection services, in the interest of national security, are authorized; or
- (8) violate a statute, treaty, or international agreement.

(e) Information marked for an indefinite duration of classification under predecessor orders, for example, "Originating Agency's Determination Required," or information classified under predecessor orders that contains no declassification instructions shall be declassified in accordance with part 3 of this order.

Sec. 1.7. Identification and Markings. (a) At the time of original classification, the following shall appear on the face of each classified document, or shall be applied to other classified media in an appropriate manner:

- (1) one of the three classification levels defined in section 1.3 of this order;

(2) the identity, by name or personal identifier and position, of the original classification authority;

(3) the agency and office of origin, if not otherwise evident;

(4) declassification instructions, which shall indicate one of the following:

(A) the date or event for declassification, as prescribed in section 1.6(a) or section 1.6(c); or

(B) the date that is 10 years from the date of original classification, as prescribed in section 1.6(b); or

(C) the exemption category from declassification, as prescribed in section 1.6(d); and

(5) a concise reason for classification which, at a minimum, cites the applicable classification categories in section 1.5 of this order.

(b) Specific information contained in paragraph (a), above, may be excluded if it would reveal additional classified information.

(c) Each classified document shall, by marking or other means, indicate which portions are classified, with the applicable classification level, which portions are exempt from declassification under section 1.6(d) of this order, and which portions are unclassified. In accordance with standards prescribed in directives issued under this order, the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office may grant waivers of this requirement for specified classes of documents or information. The Director shall revoke any waiver upon a finding of abuse.

(d) Markings implementing the provisions of this order, including abbreviations and requirements to safeguard classified working papers, shall conform to the standards prescribed in implementing directives issued pursuant to this order.

(e) Foreign government information shall retain its original classification markings or shall be assigned a U.S. classification that provides a degree of protection at least equivalent to that required by the entity that furnished the information.

(f) Information assigned a level of classification under this or predecessor orders shall be considered as classified at that level of classification despite the omission of other required markings. Whenever such informa-

tion is used in the derivative classification process or is reviewed for possible declassification, holders of such information shall coordinate with an appropriate classification authority for the application of omitted markings.

(g) The classification authority shall, whenever practicable, use a classified addendum whenever classified information constitutes a small portion of an otherwise unclassified document.

Sec. 1.8. Classification Prohibitions and Limitations. (a) In no case shall information be classified in order to:

(1) conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error;

(2) prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency;

(3) restrain competition; or

(4) prevent or delay the release of information that does not require protection in the interest of national security.

(b) Basic scientific research information not clearly related to the national security may not be classified.

(c) Information may not be reclassified after it has been declassified and released to the public under proper authority.

(d) Information that has not previously been disclosed to the public under proper authority may be classified or reclassified after an agency has received a request for it under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) or the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), or the mandatory review provisions of section 3.6 of this order only if such classification meets the requirements of this order and is accomplished on a document-by-document basis with the personal participation or under the direction of the agency head, the deputy agency head, or the senior agency official designated under section 5.6 of this order. This provision does not apply to classified information contained in records that are more than 25 years old and have been determined to have permanent historical value under title 44, United States Code.

(e) Compilations of items of information which are individually unclassified may be classified if the compiled information reveals an additional association or relationship that:

(1) meets the standards for classification under this order; and

(2) is not otherwise revealed in the individual items of information.

As used in this order, "compilation" means an aggregation of pre-existing unclassified items of information.

Sec. 1.9. Classification Challenges. (a) Authorized holders of information who, in good faith, believe that its classification status is improper are encouraged and expected to challenge the classification status of the information in accordance with agency procedures established under paragraph (b), below.

(b) In accordance with implementing directives issued pursuant to this order, an agency head or senior agency official shall establish procedures under which authorized holders of information are encouraged and expected to challenge the classification of information that they believe is improperly classified or unclassified. These procedures shall assure that:

- (1) individuals are not subject to retribution for bringing such actions;
- (2) an opportunity is provided for review by an impartial official or panel; and
- (3) individuals are advised of their right to appeal agency decisions to the Inter-agency Security Classification Appeals Panel established by section 5.4 of this order.

Part 2 Derivative Classification

Sec. 2.1. Definitions. For purposes of this order: (a) "Derivative classification" means the incorporating, paraphrasing, restating or generating in new form information that is already classified, and marking the newly developed material consistent with the classification markings that apply to the source information. Derivative classification includes the classification of information based on classification guidance. The duplication or reproduction of existing classified information is not derivative classification.

(b) "Classification guidance" means any instruction or source that prescribes the classification of specific information.

(c) "Classification guide" means a documentary form of classification guidance issued by an original classification authority that identifies the elements of information regarding a specific subject that must be clas-

sified and establishes the level and duration of classification for each such element.

(d) "Source document" means an existing document that contains classified information that is incorporated, paraphrased, restated, or generated in new form into a new document.

(e) "Multiple sources" means two or more source documents, classification guides, or a combination of both.

Sec. 2.2. Use of Derivative Classification.

(a) Persons who only reproduce, extract, or summarize classified information, or who only apply classification markings derived from source material or as directed by a classification guide, need not possess original classification authority.

(b) Persons who apply derivative classification markings shall:

- (1) observe and respect original classification decisions; and
- (2) carry forward to any newly created documents the pertinent classification markings. For information derivatively classified based on multiple sources, the derivative classifier shall carry forward:
 - (A) the date or event for declassification that corresponds to the longest period of classification among the sources; and
 - (B) a listing of these sources on or attached to the official file or record copy.

Sec. 2.3. Classification Guides. (a) Agencies with original classification authority shall prepare classification guides to facilitate the proper and uniform derivative classification of information. These guides shall conform to standards contained in directives issued under this order.

(b) Each guide shall be approved personally and in writing by an official who:

- (1) has program or supervisory responsibility over the information or is the senior agency official; and
- (2) is authorized to classify information originally at the highest level of classification prescribed in the guide.

(c) Agencies shall establish procedures to assure that classification guides are reviewed and updated as provided in directives issued under this order.

Part 3 Declassification and Downgrading

Sec. 3.1. Definitions. For purposes of this order: (a) "Declassification" means the authorized change in the status of information from classified information to unclassified information.

(b) "Automatic declassification" means the declassification of information based solely upon:

- (1) the occurrence of a specific date or event as determined by the original classification authority; or
- (2) the expiration of a maximum time frame for duration of classification established under this order.

(c) "Declassification authority" means:

- (1) the official who authorized the original classification, if that official is still serving in the same position;
- (2) the originator's current successor in function;
- (3) a supervisory official of either; or
- (4) officials delegated declassification authority in writing by the agency head or the senior agency official.

(d) "Mandatory declassification review" means the review for declassification of classified information in response to a request for declassification that meets the requirements under section 3.6 of this order.

(e) "Systematic declassification review" means the review for declassification of classified information contained in records that have been determined by the Archivist of the United States ("Archivist") to have permanent historical value in accordance with chapter 33 of title 44, United States Code.

(f) "Declassification guide" means written instructions issued by a declassification authority that describes the elements of information regarding a specific subject that may be declassified and the elements that must remain classified.

(g) "Downgrading" means a determination by a declassification authority that information classified and safeguarded at a specified level shall be classified and safeguarded at a lower level.

(h) "File series" means documentary material, regardless of its physical form or characteristics, that is arranged in accordance with a filing system or maintained as a unit

because it pertains to the same function or activity.

Sec. 3.2. Authority for Declassification.

(a) Information shall be declassified as soon as it no longer meets the standards for classification under this order.

(b) It is presumed that information that continues to meet the classification requirements under this order requires continued protection. In some exceptional cases, however, the need to protect such information may be outweighed by the public interest in disclosure of the information, and in these cases the information should be declassified. When such questions arise, they shall be referred to the agency head or the senior agency official. That official will determine, as an exercise of discretion, whether the public interest in disclosure outweighs the damage to national security that might reasonably be expected from disclosure. This provision does not:

- (1) amplify or modify the substantive criteria or procedures for classification; or
- (2) create any substantive or procedural rights subject to judicial review.

(c) If the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office determines that information is classified in violation of this order, the Director may require the information to be declassified by the agency that originated the classification. Any such decision by the Director may be appealed to the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The information shall remain classified pending a prompt decision on the appeal.

(d) The provisions of this section shall also apply to agencies that, under the terms of this order, do not have original classification authority, but had such authority under predecessor orders.

Sec. 3.3. Transferred Information. (a) In the case of classified information transferred in conjunction with a transfer of functions, and not merely for storage purposes, the receiving agency shall be deemed to be the originating agency for purposes of this order.

(b) In the case of classified information that is not officially transferred as described in paragraph (a), above, but that originated in an agency that has ceased to exist and for

which there is no successor agency, each agency in possession of such information shall be deemed to be the originating agency for purposes of this order. Such information may be declassified or downgraded by the agency in possession after consultation with any other agency that has an interest in the subject matter of the information.

(c) Classified information accessioned into the National Archives and Records Administration ("National Archives") as of the effective date of this order shall be declassified or downgraded by the Archivist in accordance with this order, the directives issued pursuant to this order, agency declassification guides, and any existing procedural agreement between the Archivist and the relevant agency head.

(d) The originating agency shall take all reasonable steps to declassify classified information contained in records determined to have permanent historical value before they are accessioned into the National Archives. However, the Archivist may require that records containing classified information be accessioned into the National Archives when necessary to comply with the provisions of the Federal Records Act. This provision does not apply to information being transferred to the Archivist pursuant to section 2203 of title 44, United States Code, or information for which the National Archives and Records Administration serves as the custodian of the records of an agency or organization that goes out of existence.

(e) To the extent practicable, agencies shall adopt a system of records management that will facilitate the public release of documents at the time such documents are declassified pursuant to the provisions for automatic declassification in sections 1.6 and 3.4 of this order.

Sec. 3.4. Automatic Declassification. (a) Subject to paragraph (b), below, within 5 years from the date of this order, all classified information contained in records that (1) are more than 25 years old, and (2) have been determined to have permanent historical value under title 44, United States Code, shall be automatically declassified whether or not the records have been reviewed. Subsequently, all classified information in such records shall be automatically declassified no

longer than 25 years from the date of its original classification, except as provided in paragraph (b), below.

(b) An agency head may exempt from automatic declassification under paragraph (a), above, specific information, the release of which should be expected to:

- (1) reveal the identity of a confidential human source, or reveal information about the application of an intelligence source or method, or reveal the identity of a human intelligence source when the unauthorized disclosure of that source would clearly and demonstrably damage the national security interests of the United States;
- (2) reveal information that would assist in the development or use of weapons of mass destruction;
- (3) reveal information that would impair U.S. cryptologic systems or activities;
- (4) reveal information that would impair the application of state of the art technology within a U.S. weapon system;
- (5) reveal actual U.S. military war plans that remain in effect;
- (6) reveal information that would seriously and demonstrably impair relations between the United States and a foreign government, or seriously and demonstrably undermine ongoing diplomatic activities of the United States;
- (7) reveal information that would clearly and demonstrably impair the current ability of United States Government officials to protect the President, Vice President, and other officials for whom protection services, in the interest of national security, are authorized;
- (8) reveal information that would seriously and demonstrably impair current national security emergency preparedness plans; or
- (9) violate a statute, treaty, or international agreement.

(c) No later than the effective date of this order, an agency head shall notify the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs of any specific file series of records for which a review or assessment has determined that the information within those file series almost invariably falls within one or more of the exemption

categories listed in paragraph (b), above, and which the agency proposes to exempt from automatic declassification. The notification shall include:

- (1) a description of the file series;
- (2) an explanation of why the information within the file series is almost invariably exempt from automatic declassification and why the information must remain classified for a longer period of time; and
- (3) except for the identity of a confidential human source or a human intelligence source, as provided in paragraph (b), above, a specific date or event for declassification of the information.

The President may direct the agency head not to exempt the file series or to declassify the information within that series at an earlier date than recommended.

(d) At least 180 days before information is automatically declassified under this section, an agency head or senior agency official shall notify the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office, serving as Executive Secretary of the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel, of any specific information beyond that included in a notification to the President under paragraph (c), above, that the agency proposes to exempt from automatic declassification. The notification shall include:

- (1) a description of the information;
- (2) an explanation of why the information is exempt from automatic declassification and must remain classified for a longer period of time; and
- (3) except for the identity of a confidential human source or a human intelligence source, as provided in paragraph (b), above, a specific date or event for declassification of the information. The Panel may direct the agency not to exempt the information or to declassify it at an earlier date than recommended. The agency head may appeal such a decision to the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The information will remain classified while such an appeal is pending.

(e) No later than the effective date of this order, the agency head or senior agency offi-

cial shall provide the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office with a plan for compliance with the requirements of this section, including the establishment of interim target dates. Each such plan shall include the requirement that the agency declassify at least 15 percent of the records affected by this section no later than 1 year from the effective date of this order, and similar commitments for subsequent years until the effective date for automatic declassification.

(f) Information exempted from automatic declassification under this section shall remain subject to the mandatory and systematic declassification review provisions of this order.

(g) The Secretary of State shall determine when the United States should commence negotiations with the appropriate officials of a foreign government or international organization of governments to modify any treaty or international agreement that requires the classification of information contained in records affected by this section for a period longer than 25 years from the date of its creation, unless the treaty or international agreement pertains to information that may otherwise remain classified beyond 25 years under this section.

Sec. 3.5. Systematic Declassification Review. (a) Each agency that has originated classified information under this order or its predecessors shall establish and conduct a program for systematic declassification review. This program shall apply to historically valuable records exempted from automatic declassification under section 3.4 of this order. Agencies shall prioritize the systematic review of records based upon:

- (1) recommendations of the Information Security Policy Advisory Council, established in section 5.5 of this order, on specific subject areas for systematic review concentration; or
- (2) the degree of researcher interest and the likelihood of declassification upon review.

(b) The Archivist shall conduct a systematic declassification review program for classified information: (1) accessioned into the National Archives as of the effective date of this order; (2) information transferred to the

Archivist pursuant to section 2203 of title 44, United States Code; and (3) information for which the National Archives and Records Administration serves as the custodian of the records of an agency or organization that has gone out of existence. This program shall apply to pertinent records no later than 25 years from the date of their creation. The Archivist shall establish priorities for the systematic review of these records based upon the recommendations of the Information Security Policy Advisory Council; or the degree of researcher interest and the likelihood of declassification upon review. These records shall be reviewed in accordance with the standards of this order, its implementing directives, and declassification guides provided to the Archivist by each agency that originated the records. The Director of the Information Security Oversight Office shall assure that agencies provide the Archivist with adequate and current declassification guides.

(c) After consultation with affected agencies, the Secretary of Defense may establish special procedures for systematic review for declassification of classified cryptologic information, and the Director of Central Intelligence may establish special procedures for systematic review for declassification of classified information pertaining to intelligence activities (including special activities), or intelligence sources or methods.

Sec. 3.6. Mandatory Declassification Review. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), below, all information classified under this order or predecessor orders shall be subject to a review for declassification by the originating agency if:

- (1) the request for a review describes the document or material containing the information with sufficient specificity to enable the agency to locate it with a reasonable amount of effort;
- (2) the information is not exempted from search and review under the Central Intelligence Agency Information Act; and
- (3) the information has not been reviewed for declassification within the past 2 years. If the agency has reviewed the information within the past 2 years, or the information is the subject of pending litigation, the agency shall in-

form the requester of this fact and of the requester's appeal rights.

(b) Information originated by:

- (1) the incumbent President;
- (2) the incumbent President's White House Staff;
- (3) committees, commissions, or boards appointed by the incumbent President; or

(4) other entities within the Executive Office of the President that solely advise and assist the incumbent President is exempted from the provisions of paragraph (a), above. However, the Archivist shall have the authority to review, downgrade, and declassify information of former Presidents under the control of the Archivist pursuant to sections 2107, 2111, 2111 note, or 2203 of title 44, United States Code. Review procedures developed by the Archivist shall provide for consultation with agencies having primary subject matter interest and shall be consistent with the provisions of applicable laws or lawful agreements that pertain to the respective Presidential papers or records. Agencies with primary subject matter interest shall be notified promptly of the Archivist's decision. Any final decision by the Archivist may be appealed by the requester or an agency to the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel. The information shall remain classified pending a prompt decision on the appeal.

(c) Agencies conducting a mandatory review for declassification shall declassify information that no longer meets the standards for classification under this order. They shall release this information unless withholding is otherwise authorized and warranted under applicable law.

(d) In accordance with directives issued pursuant to this order, agency heads shall develop procedures to process requests for the mandatory review of classified information. These procedures shall apply to information classified under this or predecessor orders. They also shall provide a means for administratively appealing a denial of a mandatory review request, and for notifying the requester of the right to appeal a final agency

decision to the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel.

(e) After consultation with affected agencies, the Secretary of Defense shall develop special procedures for the review of cryptologic information, the Director of Central Intelligence shall develop special procedures for the review of information pertaining to intelligence activities (including special activities), or intelligence sources or methods, and the Archivist shall develop special procedures for the review of information accessioned into the National Archives.

Sec. 3.7. Processing Requests and Reviews. In response to a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act of 1974, or the mandatory review provisions of this order, or pursuant to the automatic declassification or systematic review provisions of this order:

(a) An agency may refuse to confirm or deny the existence or nonexistence of requested information whenever the fact of its existence or nonexistence is itself classified under this order.

(b) When an agency receives any request for documents in its custody that contain information that was originally classified by another agency, or comes across such documents in the process of the automatic declassification or systematic review provisions of this order, it shall refer copies of any request and the pertinent documents to the originating agency for processing, and may, after consultation with the originating agency, inform any requester of the referral unless such association is itself classified under this order. In cases in which the originating agency determines in writing that a response under paragraph (a), above, is required, the referring agency shall respond to the requester in accordance with that paragraph.

Sec. 3.8. Declassification Database. (a) The Archivist in conjunction with the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office and those agencies that originate classified information, shall establish a Governmentwide database of information that has been declassified. The Archivist shall also explore other possible uses of technology to facilitate the declassification process.

(b) Agency heads shall fully cooperate with the Archivist in these efforts.

(c) Except as otherwise authorized and warranted by law, all declassified information contained within the database established under paragraph (a), above, shall be available to the public.

Part 4 Safeguarding

Sec. 4.1. Definitions. For purposes of this order: (a) "Safeguarding" means measures and controls that are prescribed to protect classified information.

(b) "Access" means the ability or opportunity to gain knowledge of classified information.

(c) "Need-to-know" means a determination made by an authorized holder of classified information that a prospective recipient requires access to specific classified information in order to perform or assist in a lawful and authorized governmental function.

(d) "Automated information system" means an assembly of computer hardware, software, or firmware configured to collect, create, communicate, compute, disseminate, process, store, or control data or information.

(e) "Integrity" means the state that exists when information is unchanged from its source and has not been accidentally or intentionally modified, altered, or destroyed.

(f) "Network" means a system of two or more computers that can exchange data or information.

(g) "Telecommunications" means the preparation, transmission, or communication of information by electronic means.

(h) "Special access program" means a program established for a specific class of classified information that imposes safeguarding and access requirements that exceed those normally required for information at the same classification level.

Sec. 4.2. General Restrictions on Access.

(a) A person may have access to classified information provided that:

- (1) a favorable determination of eligibility for access has been made by an agency head or the agency head's designee;
- (2) the person has signed an approved nondisclosure agreement; and
- (3) the person has a need-to-know the information.

(b) Classified information shall remain under the control of the originating agency or its successor in function. An agency shall not disclose information originally classified by another agency without its authorization. An official or employee leaving agency service may not remove classified information from the agency's control.

(c) Classified information may not be removed from official premises without proper authorization.

(d) Persons authorized to disseminate classified information outside the executive branch shall assure the protection of the information in a manner equivalent to that provided within the executive branch.

(e) Consistent with law, directives, and regulation, an agency head or senior agency official shall establish uniform procedures to ensure that automated information systems, including networks and telecommunications systems, that collect, create, communicate, compute, disseminate, process, or store classified information have controls that:

- (1) prevent access by unauthorized persons; and
- (2) ensure the integrity of the information.

(f) Consistent with law, directives, and regulation, each agency head or senior agency official shall establish controls to ensure that classified information is used, processed, stored, reproduced, transmitted, and destroyed under conditions that provide adequate protection and prevent access by unauthorized persons.

(g) Consistent with directives issued pursuant to this order, an agency shall safeguard foreign government information under standards that provide a degree of protection at least equivalent to that required by the government or international organization of governments that furnished the information. When adequate to achieve equivalency, these standards may be less restrictive than the safeguarding standards that ordinarily apply to United States "Confidential" information, including allowing access to individuals with a need-to-know who have not otherwise been cleared for access to classified information or executed an approved nondisclosure agreement.

(h) Except as provided by statute or directives issued pursuant to this order, classified information originating in one agency may not be disseminated outside any other agency to which it has been made available without the consent of the originating agency. An agency head or senior agency official may waive this requirement for specific information originated within that agency. For purposes of this section, the Department of Defense shall be considered one agency.

Sec. 4.3. Distribution Controls. (a) Each agency shall establish controls over the distribution of classified information to assure that it is distributed only to organizations or individuals eligible for access who also have a need-to-know the information.

(b) Each agency shall update, at least annually, the automatic, routine, or recurring distribution of classified information that they distribute. Recipients shall cooperate fully with distributors who are updating distribution lists and shall notify distributors whenever a relevant change in status occurs.

Sec. 4.4. Special Access Programs. (a) Establishment of special access programs. Unless otherwise authorized by the President, only the Secretaries of State, Defense and Energy, and the Director of Central Intelligence, or the principal deputy of each, may create a special access program. For special access programs pertaining to intelligence activities (including special activities, but not including military operational, strategic and tactical programs), or intelligence sources or methods, this function will be exercised by the Director of Central Intelligence. These officials shall keep the number of these programs at an absolute minimum, and shall establish them only upon a specific finding that:

- (1) the vulnerability of, or threat to, specific information is exceptional; and
- (2) the normal criteria for determining eligibility for access applicable to information classified at the same level are not deemed sufficient to protect the information from unauthorized disclosure; or
- (3) the program is required by statute.

(b) *Requirements and Limitations.* (1) Special access programs shall be limited to programs in which the number of persons who will have access ordinarily will be reasonably

small and commensurate with the objective of providing enhanced protection for the information involved.

(2) Each agency head shall establish and maintain a system of accounting for special access programs consistent with directives issued pursuant to this order.

(3) Special access programs shall be subject to the oversight program established under section 5.6(c) of this order. In addition, the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office shall be afforded access to these programs, in accordance with the security requirements of each program, in order to perform the functions assigned to the Information Security Oversight Office under this order. An agency head may limit access to a special access program to the Director and no more than one other employee of the Information Security Oversight Office; or, for special access programs that are extraordinarily sensitive and vulnerable, to the Director only.

(4) The agency head or principal deputy shall review annually each special access program to determine whether it continues to meet the requirements of this order.

(5) Upon request, an agency shall brief the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, or his or her designee, on any or all of the agency's special access programs.

(c) Within 180 days after the effective date of this order, each agency head or principal deputy shall review all existing special access programs under the agency's jurisdiction. These officials shall terminate any special access programs that do not clearly meet the provisions of this order. Each existing special access program that an agency head or principal deputy validates shall be treated as if it were established on the effective date of this order.

(d) Nothing in this order shall supersede any requirement made by or under 10 U.S.C. 119.

Sec. 4.5. Access by Historical Researchers and Former Presidential Appointees. (a) The requirement in section 4.2(a)(3) of this order that access to classified information may be

granted only to individuals who have a need-to-know the information may be waived for persons who:

(1) are engaged in historical research projects; or

(2) previously have occupied policy-making positions to which they were appointed by the President.

(b) Waivers under this section may be granted only if the agency head or senior agency official of the originating agency:

(1) determines in writing that access is consistent with the interest of national security;

(2) takes appropriate steps to protect classified information from unauthorized disclosure or compromise, and ensures that the information is safeguarded in a manner consistent with this order; and

(3) limits the access granted to former Presidential appointees to items that the person originated, reviewed, signed, or received while serving as a Presidential appointee.

Part 5 Implementation and Review

Sec. 5.1. Definitions. For purposes of this order: (a) "Self-inspection" means the internal review and evaluation of individual agency activities and the agency as a whole with respect to the implementation of the program established under this order and its implementing directives.

(b) "Violation" means:

(1) any knowing, willful, or negligent action that could reasonably be expected to result in an unauthorized disclosure of classified information;

(2) any knowing, willful, or negligent action to classify or continue the classification of information contrary to the requirements of this order or its implementing directives; or

(3) any knowing, willful, or negligent action to create or continue a special access program contrary to the requirements of this order.

(c) "Infraction" means any knowing, willful, or negligent action contrary to the requirements of this order or its implementing directives that does not comprise a "violation," as defined above.

Sec. 5.2. Program Direction. (a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and the co-chairs of the Security Policy Board, shall issue such directives as are necessary to implement this order. These directives shall be binding upon the agencies. Directives issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish standards for:

- (1) classification and marking principles;
- (2) agency security education and training programs;
- (3) agency self-inspection programs; and
- (4) classification and declassification guides.

(b) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall delegate the implementation and monitorship functions of this program to the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office.

(c) The Security Policy Board, established by a Presidential Decision Directive, shall make a recommendation to the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs with respect to the issuance of a Presidential directive on safeguarding classified information. The Presidential directive shall pertain to the handling, storage, distribution, transmittal, and destruction of and accounting for classified information.

Sec. 5.3. Information Security Oversight Office. (a) There is established within the Office of Management and Budget an Information Security Oversight Office. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall appoint the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office, subject to the approval of the President.

(b) Under the direction of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget acting in consultation with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office shall:

- (1) develop directives for the implementation of this order;
- (2) oversee agency actions to ensure compliance with this order and its implementing directives;

(3) review and approve agency implementing regulations and agency guides for systematic declassification review prior to their issuance by the agency;

(4) have the authority to conduct on-site reviews of each agency's program established under this order, and to require of each agency those reports, information, and other cooperation that may be necessary to fulfill its responsibilities. If granting access to specific categories of classified information would pose an exceptional national security risk, the affected agency head or the senior agency official shall submit a written justification recommending the denial of access to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget within 60 days of the request for access. Access shall be denied pending a prompt decision by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall consult on this decision with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs;

(5) review requests for original classification authority from agencies or officials not granted original classification authority and, if deemed appropriate, recommend Presidential approval through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(6) consider and take action on complaints and suggestions from persons within or outside the Government with respect to the administration of the program established under this order;

(7) have the authority to prescribe, after consultation with affected agencies, standardization of forms or procedures that will promote the implementation of the program established under this order;

(8) report at least annually to the President on the implementation of this order; and

(9) convene and chair interagency meetings to discuss matters pertaining to the program established by this order.

Sec. 5.4. Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel. (a) Establishment and Administration.

(1) There is established an Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel

("Panel"). The Secretaries of State and Defense, the Attorney General, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Archivist of the United States, and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs shall each appoint a senior level representative to serve as a member of the Panel. The President shall select the Chair of the Panel from among the Panel members.

(2) A vacancy on the Panel shall be filled as quickly as possible as provided in paragraph (1), above.

(3) The Director of the Information Security Oversight Office shall serve as the Executive Secretary. The staff of the Information Security Oversight Office shall provide program and administrative support for the Panel.

(4) The members and staff of the Panel shall be required to meet eligibility for access standards in order to fulfill the Panel's functions.

(5) The Panel shall meet at the call of the Chair. The Chair shall schedule meetings as may be necessary for the Panel to fulfill its functions in a timely manner.

(6) The Information Security Oversight Office shall include in its reports to the President a summary of the Panel's activities.

(b) *Functions.* The Panel shall:

(1) decide on appeals by persons who have filed classification challenges under section 1.9 of this order;

(2) approve, deny, or amend agency exemptions from automatic declassification as provided in section 3.4 of this order; and

(3) decide on appeals by persons or entities who have filed requests for mandatory declassification review under section 3.6 of this order.

(c) *Rules and Procedures.* The Panel shall issue bylaws, which shall be published in the *Federal Register* no later than 120 days from the effective date of this order. The bylaws shall establish the rules and procedures that the Panel will follow in accepting, considering, and issuing decisions on appeals. The rules and procedures of the Panel shall provide that the Panel will consider appeals only

on actions in which: (1) the appellant has exhausted his or her administrative remedies within the responsible agency; (2) there is no current action pending on the issue within the federal courts; and (3) the information has not been the subject of review by the federal courts or the Panel within the past 2 years.

(d) Agency heads will cooperate fully with the Panel so that it can fulfill its functions in a timely and fully informed manner. An agency head may appeal a decision of the Panel to the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The Panel will report to the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs any instance in which it believes that an agency head is not cooperating fully with the Panel.

(e) The Appeals Panel is established for the sole purpose of advising and assisting the President in the discharge of his constitutional and discretionary authority to protect the national security of the United States. Panel decisions are committed to the discretion of the Panel, unless reversed by the President.

Sec. 5.5. Information Security Policy Advisory Council. (a) *Establishment.* There is established an Information Security Policy Advisory Council ("Council"). The Council shall be composed of seven members appointed by the President for staggered terms not to exceed 4 years, from among persons who have demonstrated interest and expertise in an area related to the subject matter of this order and are not otherwise employees of the Federal Government. The President shall appoint the Council Chair from among the members. The Council shall comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. 2.

(b) *Functions.* The Council shall:

(1) advise the President, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or such other executive branch officials as it deems appropriate, on policies established under this order or its implementing directives, including recommended changes to those policies;

- (2) provide recommendations to agency heads for specific subject areas for systematic declassification review; and
- (3) serve as a forum to discuss policy issues in dispute.

(c) *Meetings.* The Council shall meet at least twice each calendar year, and as determined by the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(d) *Administration.*

(1) Each Council member may be compensated at a rate of pay not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the general schedule under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Council.

(2) While away from their homes or regular place of business in the actual performance of the duties of the Council, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons serving intermittently in the Government service (5 U.S.C. 5703(b)).

(3) To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of funds, the Information Security Oversight Office shall provide the Council with administrative services, facilities, staff, and other support services necessary for the performance of its functions.

(4) Notwithstanding any other Executive order, the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, that are applicable to the Council, except that of reporting to the Congress, shall be performed by the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the General Services Administration.

Sec. 5.6. General Responsibilities. Heads of agencies that originate or handle classified information shall: (a) demonstrate personal commitment and commit senior management to the successful implementation of the program established under this order;

(b) commit necessary resources to the effective implementation of the program established under this order; and

(c) designate a senior agency official to direct and administer the program, whose responsibilities shall include:

(1) overseeing the agency's program established under this order, provided, an agency head may designate a separate official to oversee special access programs authorized under this order. This official shall provide a full accounting of the agency's special access programs at least annually;

(2) promulgating implementing regulations, which shall be published in the *Federal Register* to the extent that they affect members of the public;

(3) establishing and maintaining security education and training programs;

(4) establishing and maintaining an ongoing self-inspection program, which shall include the periodic review and assessment of the agency's classified product;

(5) establishing procedures to prevent unnecessary access to classified information, including procedures that: (i) require that a need for access to classified information is established before initiating administrative clearance procedures; and (ii) ensure that the number of persons granted access to classified information is limited to the minimum consistent with operational and security requirements and needs;

(6) developing special contingency plans for the safeguarding of classified information used in or near hostile or potentially hostile areas;

(7) assuring that the performance contract or other system used to rate civilian or military personnel performance includes the management of classified information as a critical element or item to be evaluated in the rating of: (i) original classification authorities; (ii) security managers or security specialists; and (iii) all other personnel whose duties significantly involve the creation or handling of classified information;

(8) accounting for the costs associated with the implementation of this order,

which shall be reported to the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office for publication; and

(9) assigning in a prompt manner agency personnel to respond to any request, appeal, challenge, complaint, or suggestion arising out of this order that pertains to classified information that originated in a component of the agency that no longer exists and for which there is no clear successor in function.

Sec. 5.7. Sanctions. (a) If the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office finds that a violation of this order or its implementing directives may have occurred, the Director shall make a report to the head of the agency or to the senior agency official so that corrective steps, if appropriate, may be taken.

(b) Officers and employees of the United States Government, and its contractors, licensees, certificate holders, and grantees shall be subject to appropriate sanctions if they knowingly, willfully, or negligently:

- (1) disclose to unauthorized persons information properly classified under this order or predecessor orders;
- (2) classify or continue the classification of information in violation of this order or any implementing directive;
- (3) create or continue a special access program contrary to the requirements of this order; or
- (4) contravene any other provision of this order or its implementing directives.

(c) Sanctions may include reprimand, suspension without pay, removal, termination of classification authority, loss or denial of access to classified information, or other sanctions in accordance with applicable law and agency regulation.

(d) The agency head, senior agency official, or other supervisory official shall, at a minimum, promptly remove the classification authority of any individual who demonstrates reckless disregard or a pattern of error in applying the classification standards of this order.

(e) The agency head or senior agency official shall:

- (1) take appropriate and prompt corrective action when a violation or infraction under paragraph (b), above, occurs; and
- (2) notify the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office when a violation under paragraph (b)(1), (2) or (3), above, occurs.

Part 6 General Provisions

Sec. 6.1. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall supersede any requirement made by or under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, or the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. "Restricted Data" and "Formerly Restricted Data" shall be handled, protected, classified, downgraded, and declassified in conformity with the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and regulations issued under that Act.

(b) The Attorney General, upon request by the head of an agency or the Director of the Information Security Oversight Office, shall render an interpretation of this order with respect to any question arising in the course of its administration.

(c) Nothing in this order limits the protection afforded any information by other provisions of law, including the exemptions to the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, and the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. This order is not intended, and should not be construed, to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees. The foregoing is in addition to the specific provisos set forth in sections 1.2(b), 3.2(b) and 5.4(e) of this order.

(d) Executive Order No. 12356 of April 6, 1982, is revoked as of the effective date of this order.

Sec. 6.2. Effective Date. This order shall become effective 180 days from the date of this order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 17, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:04 p.m., April 18, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on April 20.

Statement on the Crash of an Air Force C-21 in Alabama

April 18, 1995

Hillary and I were very saddened to learn of the crash of an Air Force C-21 aircraft near Alexander City, Alabama, last night, with the loss of eight lives. The death of these individuals is a tragic loss for the U.S. Air Force and the Nation. Their death reminds us all how much we are indebted to those military and civilian personnel who serve in the defense of our Nation. Our hearts and our prayers go out to the families and friends of those who were killed.

The President's News Conference

April 18, 1995

The President. Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, before we begin the press conference, I want to express on behalf of Hillary and myself our profoundest condolences to the families and to the loved ones of the eight Americans who were killed in the crash of the Air Force plane in Alabama last night.

Tonight I want to talk about welfare reform. But before I do, I'd like to take just a minute to put welfare reform into the context of what is going on now in the United States Congress. Before the Easter break, the House of Representatives produced a flurry of ideas and proposals. Some of them were good. Some need work. Some should be rejected. My job is to work with people of good faith in both parties, in both Houses, to do what is best for America.

I was not elected to produce a pile of vetoes. And the Congress was not elected to produce a pile of political issues for the next election. My philosophy is that we have to go beyond this kind of politics-as-usual, the old debate about whether there should be more Government or less Government. I think we need a better and different Government that helps people who are helping themselves, one that offers opportunity but demands responsibility.

I have some common goals with the new Republican majority in the Congress. They say they want to reduce the deficit and the size of Government. I support that. My ad-

ministration has reduced the deficit by \$600 billion and is reducing the size of Government by over 250,000 people. In fact, if it were not for the interest we have to pay on the debt run up between 1981 and 1992, our Government's budget would be in balance today. Let me say that again, because I don't think the American people know that. If it were not for the interest we have to pay this year on the debt run up between 1981 and 1992, our Government's budget would be in balance today.

The Republicans say that they want to be tough on crime. Our crime bill is tough on crime, and I want to work with them to build on that. The Republicans are supporting the line-item veto, and so am I. I worked hard to get a version of the line-item veto passed through the Senate, and I look forward to working with them, actually getting agreement in both Houses and having a line-item veto come into law.

As we look ahead, the issue is, what are we going to do on the outstanding matters? I have commented at length on them before the newspaper editors, but let me say again, I want us to show responsibility and common sense and decency. Do we need to cut regulation, as they say? Of course, we do. But we don't need to undermine our commitment to the safety of our skies or the purity of our water and air or the sanctity of our long-term commitment to the environment. Do we need to be tough on crime? Of course, we do, but we don't need to repeal the commitment to 100,000 police officers or the assault weapons ban. Do we need to cut taxes? I believe we do, but not as much as the House bill provides. I think the tax cuts should be targeted to the middle class and to education so we raise incomes and growth for America over the long run.

Now let's talk a little about welfare. That's an issue that the Republicans and I, and the congressional Democrats should be able to agree on. They say we should end welfare as we know it. That's a commitment I made in 1992 and again in 1993 and 1994. Welfare reform is surely an example where all the people ought to be able to get together in the Congress to have reform.

We all know what we need. We need time limits for welfare recipients. We need strict

work requirements. We need very tough child support enforcement. We need more flexibility for the States. That's what our administration has been working on for more than 2 years now. We already have freed 25 States from cumbersome Federal rules and regulations so they can pursue welfare reform on their own. Tonight we're cutting redtape for two more States, for Montana and Missouri, one State with a Republican Governor, one State with a Democratic Governor, both committed to require people on welfare to go to work within 2 years. That's the same time limit I called for when I ran for President and that I called for last year.

Most people are in agreement on this. The question is, what are we going to do about it in Washington. In 1994, I introduced the most sweeping welfare reform ever presented to Congress. In 1994, Senator Dole, Senator Gramm, Senator Brown, and Senator Packwood cosponsored a pretty good bill. In 1994, Speaker, then-Congressman, Gingrich and 162 of the 175 House Republicans sponsored a bill that was an awful lot like mine. All of these bills were based on the same idea: The fundamental goal of welfare reform is to move people into the work force and to make them independent.

But the bill that passed the House of Representatives, supported by the House Republicans, in my opinion, is too weak on work and too tough on children. It saves a lot of money in the short run but at great damage to our long run interests, promoting responsible parenting and working to promote independence.

The only way to save money over the long run is to move people from welfare to work and to ensure that they have the skills to keep jobs and to stay independent. And it's wrong to cut children off just because their mothers are minor. After all, a child is a child, a baby is a baby. Whether they're white or black or brown, whether they're born in or out of wedlock, every child deserves a chance to make a good life.

Surely we should not punish children for the mistakes of their parents. Instead, we ought to give them a chance to become independent, full participating citizens, not part of the welfare population.

Let me say again, this does not have to be a partisan issue. I know that there are some here in Washington, for example, who want to fold this whole welfare reform issue into the broader budget debate. If you put it into the budget process, as those of you who live here know, it can be buried in a pile of other issues. And then there will be no need for a bipartisan consensus on welfare reform. But welfare reform is too important for that kind of Washington game. It should be open. It should be bipartisan. And we should get on with it right away.

I want to challenge Congress to pass a bipartisan welfare reform bill and put it on my desk by July the 4th, so that we can celebrate Independence Day by giving Americans on welfare the chance, the opportunity, the responsibility, to move to independence.

Surgeon General Nomination

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, Senator Dole has threatened to block Dr. Foster's nomination as Surgeon General from reaching a vote or going to the Senate floor. I have a two-part question. Are you going to the mat to fight for it? Are you going to withdraw it? And do you think that abortion, which is still lawful in this country, will be a litmus test in Presidential politics?

The President. Yes, I'm going to the mat for the nomination. Whether abortion is a litmus test in Presidential politics is up to the voters. Dr. Foster is a good man with a good record as a family doctor, as someone who has helped thousands of mothers to give birth to their children, and as an academic and as someone who has supported policies that are pro-family and pro-child. He is qualified. He should be confirmed. He should not be caught up in any kind of politics, Presidential or otherwise.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Russian Nuclear Cooperation With Iran

Q. Mr. President, two countries with which the United States has important relationships, Russia and China, want to sell nuclear technology to Iran over your objections. Can you explain why Russia, in particular, would want to give this technology to a neigh-

boring country that intelligence agencies say is determined to acquire nuclear weapons? And do you think that when you go to Moscow that you will be able to persuade Mr. Yeltsin to cancel the sale?

The President. Well, as you know, I cannot explain why Russia would do it since I don't believe that it's in their interest to do it. I don't think it's right, and I don't think it's in their interest. If you ask them, I think they would say that they had a prior contractual obligation to do it, and they believe that the level of nuclear technology in the powerplants is so low that it won't lead to the development of a nuclear weapon. I believe that's what they would say. I think that's what the Chinese would say. But I disagree with them, and we're continuing to work with them.

The United States and our people have benefited greatly from this new engagement we've had with Russia and for our attempts to promote the nonproliferation agenda. There are nuclear weapons, large numbers of them now, being destroyed in Russia, weapons from Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union that had them before. And we are destroying weapons. For the first time, there are no Russian nuclear missiles pointed at the United States. So we are moving ahead in our nonproliferation agenda. I do not believe it's in their interest to do this. I understand what they say, but I disagree with them. And I hope I'll be able to prevail. I intend to continue to be quite aggressive on it.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

"The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam"

Q. Mr. President, you've been quoted as saying that you believe that Robert McNamara's new book, in which he essentially says that the U.S. had no underlying basis for the war in Vietnam, vindicates your own opposition to the war. I wonder if we could hear you talk about that. And also, if in this time of reflection, you feel vindicated about your handling of your own draft status?

The President. On the second matter, I've said all I have to say about it.

On the first, I believed our policy was incorrect. I think the book supports that conclusion. But I do not believe that the book should be used as yet another opportunity

to divide the United States over that. We should learn about what happened, resolve not to repeat our mistakes, honor the service of Americans, and go forward together. That's what we should be doing.

Trade With Japan

Q. The Japanese are threatening to pull out of auto talks unless U.S. negotiators stop threatening sanctions. Are you willing to do that? Are we at risk of a trade war?

The President. Well, we should not be at risk of a trade war, but I would remind you that we have been very patient as a country for a very long time in this area. And our major trade deficit in the world, except for our oil imports, has been with Japan and, of course, now with China and other countries in Asia combined. But Japan is a country that is a wealthy country, almost as wealthy as we are when you compare purchasing power parity, where consumer prices within the country of Japan are much, much higher than they are in the United States and could be maintained at that high level only by a sophisticated system of direct and indirect protectionism, which is most manifest in this area. We have strong differences. We have worked hard to resolve our trade differences with Japan. We have made some significant progress in other areas. And I'm going to let Ambassador Kantor continue to pursue this one in the way that we have agreed upon. I think that he is proceeding in good faith.

New Political Dialog

Q. Mr. President, when a politician starts talking about the irrelevancy or inadequacy of terms such as liberal and conservative, and even adds, as you did in Dallas, Democrat and Republican, usually they're in trouble or see a bad patch coming down the road. Is that the case with you, or why did you bring the issue up again?

The President. First of all, that's what I said when I ran for President; that's what I said when I was head of the Democratic Leadership Council; that's what I said when I was the Governor of my State: That we were going into a new era, when a lot of the old divisions and old labels didn't mean the same thing. We have to redefine them. And I have sought to redefine them from the be-

ginning of my campaign for President and indeed before. And I still find it very frustrating from time to time when I am not successful in redefining it, because I think the American people—to the American people, a lot of what they hear and see and read up here, is a real turn-off because it seems that these categories of debate are extreme on both sides and don't fit with their experience and their concerns for the future.

Q. Do you think you failed in that regard?

The President. No, I think that—I think that we're in a process in which a new political dialog and a new understanding is struggling to be born. I think that in the last election, if you say, you choose more government or less, less wins; you choose more taxes or less, less wins. But everybody instinctively knows that's not the real choice. The real choice is, does it make sense to cut Head Start? Does it make sense to cut immunizations for kids or college loans? No. Does it make sense to cut bureaucracy? Yes. So the real question is, how do we have a language that reflects what people know is the right thing for the country to do. And I'm doing my best to help the country develop the language and the debate.

Family Values and Moral Virtue

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you a philosophical question tonight. A number of the Nation's social critics have been saying lately that America is what they call a morally bewildered society. And they cite as evidence the fact that much of the Nation's political discourse and its public debate centers on the subject of family values. These critics say that family values is really a fig leaf or a euphemism to cover up the Nation's moral relativism.

I'd like to know if you think that the distinction between moral virtue—in the ancient Roman or old Victorian sense—the distinction between that and family values is a valid and legitimate one. And if you do, do you think that you and the other candidates in the '96 Presidential contest should debate the Nation's social compact on the basis of instilling moral virtue rather than family values?

The President. Well, I think family values require moral virtue. I mean, family values

mean to me that people make common sacrifices to stay together, to work together, to put primacy on the family unit and the rearing of children and to put their children first. I think that that has been at the bedrock of our success as a country and as a bedrock of other successful civilizations. And I think when people cease to put the interest of their children and the future ahead of their interest of themselves in the short run, we get in trouble.

I believe that if you look at the successes in this country, both the individual successes and the places where there are broad success, there are strong support for families, and families are generally successful. I also believe that America worries so much about moral relativism because we are the least relativistic of all the big countries. We are the most religious. We are the most likely to believe not only in God but in absolute rules of right and wrong here on Earth. And I think the fact that we worry about it shows that we have problems in our country which are inconsistent with our beliefs, and we know that we can't solve our problems purely by some common social action. We also require personal changes to solve those problems. I think that is a broadly held belief in the United States, and I certainly believe that. And my experience is consistent with that.

Yes, Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio].

Affirmative Action

Q. Mr. President, in California recently you urged Democrats who are grappling with the issue of affirmative action to be sensitive to the feelings of angry white males. And if you were addressing a group of so-called angry white males tonight, how would you convince them that Federal programs that have goals of giving a certain percentage of contracts or jobs to minorities are good and fair for everyone, including white males?

The President. Well, first of all I don't want to prejudge the review of all the Federal programs that I'm going through. So I wouldn't—I don't want to answer that question. But I would say first of all to them—I will answer the question when I complete the review, which won't be long. But I don't

want to do—I would say, though, the earnings of male workers, including white male workers, have been declining when measured against inflation, for years now. So people are working harder—these male workers are working harder for lower wages, unless they have good educations or are in a section of the economy that's growing very rapidly. I would say to them, your problem is the problem of what's happening to wages and rising inequality in the United States. And it was caused primarily by foreign competition, technology, the weakening of organized labor, the collapse of the minimum wage, and according to the study which was in the paper today, the tax and budgetary policies of the last 12 years before I became President which aggravated inequality.

And what I am trying to do is, number one, give you equality again with better jobs, more jobs, a higher minimum wage, a tax cut for workers with modest incomes and children in the home, about \$1,000 a year for incomes under \$25,000 this year; and that on affirmative action, your principle should be, we're all better off if everybody's got an even chance, if there's no discrimination, if people have the opportunity to live up to the fullest of their ability, but the Government should never give someone who is unqualified anything over someone who is qualified.

Robert G. Torricelli Investigation

Q. Congressman Torricelli of New Jersey is embroiled in a controversy over the revelations he made about the CIA and its apparent involvement in murders in Guatemala. You have indicated your concerns about the CIA's conduct. I want to know what your thoughts are about Congressman Torricelli's conduct? Should he have revealed that information or not? And if he should not have, should he be disciplined?

The President. Well, what should happen to him depends on, number one, what the facts are, and, number two, what the House decides to do with it. And they have to do their investigation, and they have to make their determination.

What I do believe is that the United States owes the American people a thorough investigation of the allegations of what went on. And it may take a little time because these

are things which occurred by and large before I became President. But I've asked the Intelligence Oversight Board to look into it. I expect them to do a thorough and deep job, and I expect to have the truth, and I expect us to take the appropriate action. That is exactly what we will do. But it is not for me to judge Congressman Torricelli.

Q. [*Inaudible*]*—at all about the information coming out as the person ultimately responsible as the guardian of American intelligence?*

The President. I am concerned about the information coming out, but in the end, I think that it is unlikely given the facts of this case that certain information would not have come out.

Yes, Peter [Peter Maer, Westwood One Radio], and then Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News].

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, outward appearances would indicate that one of your key foreign policy goals, a comprehensive Middle East peace, is deadlocked, especially on the Israeli-Syrian track. Is there a stalemate? And especially in light of the recent terrorist incidents, and word today that Syria wants to get land to the Sea of Galilee?

The President. Well, I won't comment on the details of the negotiations between them because that would only complicate matters. It is difficult. We knew it would be difficult. I do believe that both Prime Minister Rabin and President Asad want to make a comprehensive peace. I do believe that both of them understand they don't have unlimited time. I do believe that the United States still has the trust of both parties in working to help them reach an agreement. And as concerned as I am about it, I am more hopeful today than I was, let's say, 45 days ago. We just have to keep at it.

Q. Sir, I want to ask you—

Q. [*Inaudible*]*—stalemate incorrect then?*

The President. I think the correct perception is that we're not on the edge of a breakthrough. But that does not mean that there is no ongoing work on this and that does not mean that the parties have basically hardened their hearts and minds and decided that

there will not be a resolution of this in the fairly near-term.

Central Intelligence Agency

Q. Sir, there's something funny going on out at the CIA. I wonder just how many times you have looked into it and had a really good, honest briefing on it. But today we have found out that they are taking their classified documents and sending them by mail to retired former CIA people. This gets them out of the records, out of the storehouse out there, and gets them into a private home where nobody could ever find them if they conducted a congressional investigation of CIA reports. Some of these are classified and some are not, but they have the names on them of the officers who worked on them, and they have mailed them back to the officers who worked on them. Why they are doing this, I don't know, but it sounds like they are trying to keep us from getting a chance at the records.

The President. Let me make two comments quickly on that. First of all, I have made it clear to the Intelligence Oversight Board that I want a thorough investigation of all these matters—and clear to the CIA leadership there, including the Acting Director, that I want the records, the relevant records, secured and accounted for.

Secondly, I think this reinforces the need for the United States Senate to hold quick confirmation hearings and have a prompt vote on John Deutch to be the new Director. Let's get him out there so we can get on with the business of doing what we need to do.

1996 Election

Q. Sir, I know you've said that you'd like to put politics aside for a certain period, but last week you opened—you formally opened your campaign office for reelection in town here. And I was wondering if you might take a minute to say—to fill in the blank, and say, I believe I should be reelected President in 1996 because—and take it from there.

The President. I believe I should be reelected—[laughter]—because I have done what I said I would do, because we have got good results, and because the policies that I now advocate, most importantly, will ad-

dress the outstanding problems of the country.

If you look at this problem of inequality. If you look at the economic problems, what is the response? The response is to invest more in education, to raise the minimum wage, to expand trade in high wage products in the United States to generate more jobs.

If you look at the problems of the social fabric that you asked about, what is the answer? The answer is to tell people the truth about things they have to do to make things better, to assume more responsibility, to do the right things but to have policies, from welfare reform to supporting children, to doing things to make adoptions easier and more preferable to other alternatives, which we're working on now, that build up families and build up communities.

We are moving the country in the right direction. We are doing what we said we would do. We are getting results. This country is in a stronger position today than it was 2 years ago.

Taxes

Q. Mr. President, the idea of a flat tax is more and more popular with a lot of people. In your mind, what would be wrong with a flat tax? And more fundamentally, for lack of a more elegant term, what's wrong with blowing up the present tax structure as it is?

The President. Well, I tell you what, after I just went over my tax returns last week, that has more appeal than it did a week ago. [Laughter] And I think a lot of Americans feel that way.

On the flat tax. What we have to do is to put a pencil to a piece of paper and see how it works. All the studies I have seen say that all the proposals out there now will raise taxes for people with incomes under \$200,000 and lower taxes for people with incomes over \$200,000, like my wife and myself, which would be unfair, and that if they don't do that, they explode the deficit. So the question is, we can't explode the deficit, and we can't be unfair. Can we simplify the tax system without being unfair or increasing the deficit? And if we can do it, then I am open to it. But the studies are not promising on the proposals that are out there now.

Strength of the Dollar

Q. Mr. President, both you and your Treasury Secretary have said repeatedly that a strong dollar is in America's interest. But some people don't believe you because they don't see you taking any specific steps to try to make that happen. Can you tell the American people why this would be in America's interest, particularly since a weak dollar encourages export sales, and since the inflation it might cause seems nowhere on the horizon? And if you do want a strong dollar, what can you do or what are you willing to do to achieve it?

The President. In the present climate, the ability of governments to affect the strength of their currency or in the case of Japan, as you see, that would like a weaker yen, the ability of governments that have strong currencies to get a weaker one, in the short run, may be limited, as we have seen in countless examples over the last several years. So what you have to do is work over the long run.

The United States does want a strong dollar. We believe in the importance of fundamentals in our economy. We believe in getting the deficit down, getting jobs up and pursuing a responsible course. I have done that for 2 years. I will continue to do that.

Yes, Judy [Judy Keen, USA Today].

Q. Can you tell us sir—to follow up—what a strong dollar would do for the economy?

The President. Well, the point is that a weak dollar, eventually, over a long period of time, will weaken the economy, either by bringing inflation into it or by upsetting the whole complex international fabric of business relationships that are carried on in dollars. So we do have an interest over the long run in a strong currency. But we have to look at it—but for Government—Government actions need to be directed toward long-term fundamentals, sound economic policies, sound growth policies, sound investment policies.

Yes, Judy [Judy Keen, USA Today].

President's Leadership Role

Q. President Clinton, Republicans have dominated political debate in this country since they took over Congress in January. And even tonight, two of the major television networks declined to broadcast this event

live. Do you worry about making sure that your voice is heard in the coming months?

The President. No. I would remind you, I had at least one press conference during the previous 2 years when I had it at night, but only one of the networks covered it, as I remember. But the important thing is for me to do these press conferences on a regular basis, and every 3 or 4 months, to do it at night so that anyone who wants to cover it, can.

The Constitution gives me relevance. The power of our ideas gives me relevance. The record we have built up over the last 2 years and the things we're trying to do to implement it, give it relevance. The President is relevant here, especially an activist President. And the fact that I am willing to work with the Republicans. The question is, are they willing to work with me? I have shown good faith. That's how we got two of those bills in the contract that I supported in 1992 signed into law. That's how we got a strong showing among Senate Democrats for the line-item veto. I have shown good faith. The question is, what happens now?

Surgeon General Nomination

Q. Mr. President, as a follow-up to Helen's question about the Foster nomination, it is now at the whim not only of Majority Leader Dole but three other Presidential candidates who are in the Senate, and then when the going gets tough, there are some Democrats who may very well run for cover. I'm wondering if you can tell us if Dr. Foster knows himself the difficult period that lies ahead if, as you say, you are going to the mat with this and whether—and the possible or probable outcome.

The President. I think he knows that it will be difficult. I think that he has been warned repeatedly, not by me but by reading it in the press or seeing it, that Presidential politics seems to have found its way into his nomination. But you know, sometimes the American system works the way it's supposed to, and sometimes the right thing has been done.

I will say again: He is a distinguished physician. He is a good man. He has a good record. He should be confirmed.

Enola Gay Exhibit

Q. Can you explain why you supported the veterans' effort to end the Smithsonian's exhibit of the Enola Gay, which was seen by many as an effort to educate the public on the pros and cons of the nuclear bomb? Is this subject taboo in the United States?

The President. No, I don't think the subject is taboo. I don't think the subject is taboo. But my simple position is, as I said to the newspaper editors, that painful though it is, even after 50 years, that President Truman did the right thing. And I do not believe that on the celebration of the end of the war and the service and the sacrifice of our people, that that is the appropriate time to be asking about or launching a major reexamination of that issue. Anyone who wants to write a book about it, express a contrary opinion, is perfectly free to do so, but I don't think that the policy of my administration or the United States should be to say that's the way to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. I disagree with that. I don't think it's right.

Yes, Jill [Jill Dougherty, CNN].

Russia

Q. Mr. President, in terms of your upcoming trip to Russia, in spite of what your administration has said numerous times to Russia about NATO expansion, the Russian—the Yeltsin government either does not understand or will not understand that that is not a threat to them. And in fact, some people in Russia are now talking about rearming in a nuclear fashion to allay some—any type of attack from the West.

When you meet with Boris Yeltsin, what will you say to him to convince him that it is not a threat?

The President. I will say what I have always said, that NATO is not an offensive alliance; it is a defensive alliance, a security alliance; that NATO has worked with Russia and Bosnia; that NATO has invited Russia to be a part of the Partnership For Peace and has not excluded anybody from potential NATO membership; that Russia, in terms of its security interest, has nothing to fear from a NATO which expands in a gradual, open, straightforward way and, at the same time, is deepening its relationship with Russia.

Q. Why does Mr. Yeltsin not understand that? He's said it numerous times.

The President. That is something you'll have to ask them. I understand they're—you know, they have the same sort of domestic political pressures that every country has and misunderstandings, but I think the United States has shown its good faith in our dealings with Russia.

The United States did not move aggressively to help Russia overcome the burden of decades of Communist economics and other problems that were left when the cold war was over and the Soviet Union collapsed to turn around and make Russia an enemy. That is not why we did all that work to help rebuild their economy, to support their movement to democracy, to support their integration and their work with the G-7 and all these other countries. We have shown our good faith. But we cannot and we should not give any nation a veto over the expansion of NATO when it is otherwise appropriate to do so.

International Financial Reform

Q. Mr. President, concerning—to follow up on the question about the dollar, there is growing concern that there is instability within the international financial system as a whole. There are some proposals, like I know the Japanese Finance Minister put out a proposal regarding international financial reform, reform of the international system. How do you view this situation? And what would be your primary concerns in such a reform of the international financial system?

The President. First, let me say that this is an issue which needs to be addressed, but it needs to be addressed in a very thoughtful way so as not to further aggravate whatever conditions exist there. It is obvious that the integration of the global financial markets have—that that has many advantages—that you can get money to places in a hurry, that places that have been underdeveloped can develop more quickly, that you can develop the sophisticated trading relationships more rapidly, and that this is all a positive.

It is also obvious that as with almost every other element in the modern society that we live in, every force of integration carries within it the seeds of potential disintegration, of

rapid unraveling. So last year that's why I asked the heads of the other G-7 countries, the other major economies, to devote a discussion this summer when we meet in Canada to this subject. We have been working on it; the Japanese have been working on it; the Canadians have been working on it; the Europeans have been working on it. And we will have a long talk about it this summer. We will do our very best to come up with sensible statements about where we go from here.

George [George Condon, Copley News Service].

Japan-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on the answer you gave a moment ago, when you spoke last week about President Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb, Americans overwhelmingly thought you were right not to apologize. The Japanese overwhelmingly thought you were insensitive. Were you surprised that 50 years after the event there is still that wide divergence of opinion? And do you see any chance of that gulf ever being bridged?

The President. The way to bridge the gulf is to talk about the friendship that we have now, the respect and regard that we have now, the common interests that we have now. I did not say that to hurt anyone's feelings or to be insensitive to anyone in Japan. I know what a terrible, terrible loss of life there was, how many scarred families there were, how difficult it was. It was hard in World War II. Twenty million Russians lost their lives in World War II. No one can fail to be sensitive to the loss.

Do I wish none of it had happened? Of course, I do. But that does not mean that President Truman, in the moment of decision, made the wrong decision or that the United States can now apologize for a decision that we did not believe then and I do not believe now was the wrong one. That has nothing to do with my feelings for the Japanese people, my profound sorrow at the suffering and the agony that they went through.

But we have recovered from that. We have gone on from that. We have one of the world's most important bilateral relationships. The thing we need to do now is to

join together and look to the future. We're up to our ears in challenges today. Let's get on with dealing with them in mutual respect and support. And that's the way to get this behind us.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 93d news conference began at 9:01 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel; and President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Tansu Ciller of Turkey

April 19, 1995

The President. Let me say that, as always, it's good to have Prime Minister Ciller back in Washington. I welcome her here. Turkey is a valued, important ally of the United States, and our relationship will become even more important in the years ahead.

We're about to go into a meeting where we will discuss a number of issues, her programs for democratization and for economic reform, the Turkish operation in Northern Iraq, which obviously, the United States hopes will be limited in duration and scope. We'll talk about Cyprus and a number of other issues—whatever the Prime Minister wants to discuss. But I'm looking forward to the conversation, and I'm glad she's here.

Turkish Operations in Iraq

Q. Do you expect her to set a date for the evacuation from Iraq? And is Iraq supporting her drive against the Kurds?

The President. Why don't you ask her those questions?

Q. I will. Do you plan to set a date for withdrawal from Iraq? And is Iraq supporting this drive against the Kurds? Are there good Kurds and bad Kurds?

Prime Minister Ciller. As you know, we were together in the fight against Iraq in the Gulf crisis, and then we were together again with the United States in Provide Comfort to protect the Kurdish people in Northern Iraq against Saddam's regime. And it so happened, however, that Turkey was probably

the only ally which paid—who paid very high costs because we happen to have a border with Iraq. And Northern Iraq, in time, became a no-man's land.

And this was not a decision that I enjoyed taking, but it so happened that the terrorists simply settled in Northern Iraq and planned to have operations within my country passing the borders. Any Western country in my position would have to have—would take the same kind of decision that I did. And we are there only for a limited time. We have gotten hold of the bases that we wanted to do. The majority of the job is done and over with. The withdrawal will be very soon, as I have said from the beginning.

The reason that I cannot announce a date is because it would not be fair for those people up on the mountains, 1,500 feet from the ground—meters from the ground, not feet—in the caves, in the snow, and they are approaching our borders. What they are doing is searching the caves up on the mountains for the guns and the ammunitions that would have been used to kill the innocent people in my country.

So I have to say that I'm very grateful to President Clinton for his support and for the fact that they knew about what was happening in Northern Iraq, that this became a no-man's land without authority, and it's not our making. It is not only our responsibility either. We have to think of a way to handle this. Otherwise, Turkey always ends up being the only ally to continually pay for this operation and the end result of this operation.

Q. Are you adamantly against the establishment of a state of Kurdistan? Isn't this the motive of the rebels?

Prime Minister Ciller. We are very friendly towards the Kurdish people in Northern Iraq. We have nothing against it. In fact, the Kurdish people in Northern Iraq were quite happy to see us come in because what had happened is that the Kurdish elements had been pushed towards south and had to evacuate Northern Iraq because of the terrorists. Now that the terrorists have simply run away, there is the possibility of these Kurdish elements coming back to Northern Iraq and settling.

We had, as you know, opened up our borders to the Kurdish people in Northern Iraq.

Close to a million people came over after the Gulf crisis, and we sheltered them and we fed them. And last year only, we paid \$13.5 million in foodstuff to the Kurdish people living in Northern Iraq. And every year, we supply the electricity and basic needs. So this has nothing to do with the Kurdish people.

Turkey

Q. Prime Minister, today in Turkey 21 people have been arrested on allegations of trying to assassinate you. I wondered how you felt about your own security, if you were worried about the stability of your government.

Prime Minister Ciller. Well, I am not worried about the security of my country or myself. I have a mission, and that mission is a peace mission for the area. And that's what I'm going to discuss with President Clinton. And Turkey's actual acceptance into the European Community and Customs Union, I think, is a historic kind of a turnaround. And I have to thank again the President's administration and to President Clinton for the very historic support they have given on the issue, because had Turkey been separated from Europe, it would have meant that fundamentalism would have moved up to the borders of Europe. And Turkey, in the area, is the only stable ally from Korea to the Gulf crisis.

We are—look at where we are stationed. North of us is the Soviet Union, having disintegrated. The new countries that have emerged have their own problems. East to us is Middle East. We are very friendly towards Israel—and I was the first Prime Minister to go to Israel—and friendly to the Arab world at the same time. And we have good relations with the Caspian Sea—new nations that have emerged, such as Azerbaijan and Armenia and—

Cyprus

Q. How about Greece? Cyprus?

Prime Minister Ciller. Oh, yes. The whole problem—that's why the Customs Union is so important because once—if and when Turkey is accepted as a full member into the European Union, as Greece is and as Cyprus will, together with the Turkish and

the Greek side, the problem will be resolved in a very comprehensive way because then we won't have anything to fight about, such as migration or migration of labor or some of the basic problems that had continued for almost centuries now as far as I'm concerned.

The President's News Conference

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. I thought it was good—the press conference. There were a lot of questions. There were a broad range of questions. They were interesting questions, and I gave straightforward answers, and they were brief. So I thought it was good.

Q. Mr. President, one thing you didn't get to answer last night is that Speaker Gingrich has threatened to put all sorts of legislation that you oppose onto the debt ceiling bill and in effect threaten you to veto the bill and shut the Government down. Would you do that if there was legislation on there you didn't like?

The President. No President of the United States can ever be, in effect, blackmailed by that sort of thing. I'm going to do what I think is right for the people of this country. And again—I will say again what I said last night, the only thing that's relevant to the American people in this whole process is what we do here to affect their lives, and their future, and their children's future.

I have demonstrated my commitment to working through this process. We've already signed two good bills. We're working on this line-item veto together. We can do a lot of work. We can have a lot of good ceremonies out there in the Rose Garden, or we can have the kind of conflict that could arise unless there is a real attempt to work these things out.

And I have been very, very clear and forthright about my position about these things all along and will continue to be. But a strategy to sort of put me in a box would be an error because I will still exercise the power of the Presidency in the interest of the American people.

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.]

The President. Nice to see you all.

Turkish Operations in Iraq

Q. Mr. President, your administration has certainly shown a certain degree of understanding of Turkey's incursion in Northern Iraq. How willing are you to cooperate in possible secret arrangements for—[inaudible]—incursion in this region?

The President. Well, we're going to discuss that in our meetings. And I don't think I should say anything about it until we have meetings. But you know, the United States has had a strong relationship with Turkey. And I think it's very important that we continue that relationship into the future. And in order to do it, we're going to have to understand each other's position, each other's problems, each other's potential to work together. And I've tried to do that, and I've had a good relationship with the Prime Minister. She has been very forceful in coming to the United States and stating the interest of the Turkish people. And this is one of many things that we will discuss. But I look forward to continuing to make progress on all these issues.

Turkey

Q. Will human rights and democratization be on the agenda?

The President. Sure. And the Prime Minister's talked about democratization. And I think—you know, for the Europeans, as you move toward the Customs Union and other things, these issues are quite important. And they're very important to the United States. But I have tried to also view them in the context of the imperative to fight terrorism and to promote human rights. And I think you have to do both. Preserving a democracy in which people have human freedom is a delicate operation. And it requires not only a lot of sensitivity and understanding, it requires a lot of discipline and respect for other people's rights as well. And the biggest threat to human rights all over the world today, after the—in the aftermath of the cold war when people now know that dictatorial political systems don't work, that totalitarian systems don't work, the biggest threat to human rights is the reaction caused by terrorism everywhere. And that is something we have to be sensitive to, whether it's a car bomb blowing up in the Middle East or a religious fa-

natic taking a vial of sarin into the subway in Japan. All these things threaten the fabric of human rights. So we have to continue to push governments all over the world to be more open to human rights and combat terrorism at the same time.

Q. Do you have any solution about—[in-audible]—administration?

The President. We're going to talk about it today. You know, the United States has expressed an understanding of what Turkey did, along with the hope that civilian casualties could be strictly limited, and that the operation would be limited in time and scope. But we're going to talk about it. The Prime Minister has probably got some good ideas, and we'll discuss it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on the Oklahoma City Bombing

April 19, 1995

The bombing in Oklahoma City was an attack on innocent children and defenseless citizens. It was an act of cowardice, and it was evil. The United States will not tolerate it. And I will not allow the people of this country to be intimidated by evil cowards.

I have met with our team, which we assembled to deal with this bombing. And I have determined to take the following steps to assure the strongest response to this situation:

First, I have deployed a crisis management team under the leadership of the FBI, working with the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, military and local authorities. We are sending the world's finest investigators to solve these murders.

Second, I have declared an emergency in Oklahoma City. And at my direction, James Lee Witt, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, is now on his way there to make sure we do everything we can to help the people of Oklahoma deal with the tragedy.

Third, we are taking every precaution to reassure and to protect people who work in or live near other Federal facilities.

Let there be no room for doubt: We will find the people who did this. When we do, justice will be swift, certain, and severe. These people are killers, and they must be treated like killers.

Finally, let me say that I ask all Americans tonight to pray—to pray for the people who have lost their lives, to pray for the families and the friends of the dead and the wounded, to pray for the people of Oklahoma City.

May God's grace be with them. Meanwhile, we will be about our work.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:30 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Statement on Reform of Regulations Implementing the Community Reinvestment Act

April 19, 1995

Today, I am pleased to announce completion of a commitment I made to reform the regulations implementing the Community Reinvestment Act. These reforms help fulfill two important promises I made to the American people: to increase access to credit for all Americans, and to decrease Federal regulatory burdens.

Combined with my administration's community development banks and financial institutions initiative, the Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community program, an expanded earned-income tax credit, and our continuing effort to strengthen the economy, the reformed Community Reinvestment Act regulations will give many more Americans a chance to realize the American dream by greatly expanding individual opportunity—empowering every American to improve their own lives.

At a time when funding from all levels of government is scarcer and scarcer, the ability of our communities to help themselves takes on special importance. That's what the Community Reinvestment Act is all about.

With the new regulations in place, the statute will increasingly have a positive impact on the lives of countless Americans who work

and play by the rules. Many more financial institutions will discover new, profitable lines of business. And it doesn't cost taxpayers a dime. It can create miracles in small towns and big cities from coast to coast, miracles like mortgage or business loans for people who never thought they could own a house or business, multifamily housing loans, and commercial development loans in low to moderate income communities.

To maximize the benefits that can accrue to both banks and consumers, the final regulation issued today by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Thrift Supervision, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will place emphasis on performance, not paperwork. The new regulations will make the act easier for banks to implement and will result in more consistent evaluation of their performance. With these improved regulations in place, the statute can reach its full potential to help our communities help themselves. Now is the time to end uncertainty and get on with business, not to tinker with the statute.

Producing this final regulation has taken a lot of effort on the part of the regulators and has involved excellent input from financial institutions and community groups throughout the country. I want to congratulate and thank everybody who participated in this process.

Letter to Governor Frank Keating on Disaster Assistance to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

April 19, 1995

Dear Governor Keating:

I have declared an emergency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (the Stafford Act) for the city of Oklahoma City in the State of Oklahoma due to the explosion at the Federal courthouse in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995 in the State of Oklahoma. I have authorized Federal relief and emergency assistance in the affected area.

Emergency assistance under Title V of the Stafford Act will be provided. Assistance

under this emergency declaration will be provided at 100 percent Federal funding.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will coordinate Federal assistance efforts and designate specific areas eligible for such assistance. The Federal Coordinating Officer will be Mr. Dell Greer of FEMA. He will consult with you and assist in the execution of the FEMA-State Agreement governing the expenditure of Federal funds.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was attached to a statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing disaster assistance to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Letter to Federal Emergency Management Agency Director James Lee Witt on Disaster Assistance to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

April 19, 1995

Dear Mr. Witt:

I have determined that the explosion at the Federal courthouse in Oklahoma City, on April 19, 1995, in the State of Oklahoma is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant an emergency declaration under subsection 501(b) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (the Stafford Act). My decision to make this declaration pursuant to subsection 501(b) of the Stafford Act is based upon the fact that the explosion occurred at a Federally-owned courthouse. I, therefore, declare that such an emergency exists in the city of Oklahoma City in the State of Oklahoma.

In order to provide Federal assistance, you are hereby authorized to coordinate and direct other Federal agencies and fund activities not authorized under other Federal statutes and allocate from funds available for these purposes, such amounts as you find necessary for Federal emergency assistance and administrative expenses.

Pursuant to this emergency declaration, you are authorized to provide emergency assistance as you deem appropriate under Title V of the Stafford Act at 100 percent Federal funding.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was attached to a statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing disaster assistance to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

**Remarks Welcoming President
Fernando Cardoso of Brazil**

April 20, 1995

President Cardoso and Mrs. Cardoso, distinguished guests. I am pleased to welcome to Washington a good friend of the United States and one of our hemisphere's most dynamic leaders.

Mr. President, let me begin by expressing my appreciation and the appreciation of the American people for the call and the message you sent to us yesterday in the wake of the terrible incident in Oklahoma City. Let me say again, those responsible will be brought to justice. They will be tried, convicted, and punished. We will never let the forces of inhumanity prevail in the United States.

At this moment, the rescue efforts in Oklahoma City continue. And we hold out hope that more survivors will be found. To all those carrying on this dangerous work, to the families and loved ones of those still missing, our prayers are with you. And to all those here watching and those who are watching us through the airwaves, I have ordered all our flags today throughout the United States to be flown at half-mast. And I ask you now to join with me in a moment of silence for the victims.

[At this point, a moment of silence was observed.]

May God's grace be with them.

Mr. President, as the largest democracies in the Americas, our countries have a special responsibility to work together, to support the extraordinary trend toward democracies and open markets throughout our region. Today we will pursue that joint action. We both know it is needed to manage our common problems and to seize our shared opportunities.

Mr. President, your own life embodies the resilience of the democratic spirit of the Americas. Thirty years ago, you were forced

into exile by the enemies of democracy. But instead of giving in to bitterness, you carried on the struggle for freedom with reason and reconciliation as your only weapons. And you prevailed.

Now you lead a nation that has remained at peace with its neighbors for more than a century. That strong tradition of peaceful relations and your personal commitment to democracy give Brazil a vital role to play in strengthening cooperation among the nations and deepening the roots of civil society throughout our hemispheres. The United States welcomes the opportunity to work with you in this noble cause.

We must also work to further the goal we set at the Summit of the Americas, to create a free trade area of the Americas by the year 2005. The building blocks of free trade, the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and MERCOSUR, are in place. Now let us move forward to transform our vision of a commercially integrated hemisphere into concrete reality.

The emerging partnership between our two countries extends beyond supporting democracy in emerging markets. We are also joining forces to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to protect the environment, to fight against drug smuggling, and to keep peace in countries that are threatened by ethnic conflict and civil war. The United States is counting on Brazil's continued leadership in meeting these major challenges of our time.

Mr. President, you represent a vibrant people whose pride in the past is matched only by their hope for the future. Your own efforts to bring economic stability and social justice to Brazil are responsible for much of that promise of tomorrow. On this solid foundation and under your leadership, Brazil is poised to take its rightful place as a shining example for all the Americas and all the world.

Mr. President, we are honored to have you here. Welcome to the White House. Welcome to the United States.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:42 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

The President's News Conference With President Cardoso of Brazil

April 20, 1995

President Clinton. Good afternoon. Please be seated.

I am delighted to welcome President Cardoso to the White House. For many years he has been one of the great leaders of the Americas. Although he was only inaugurated in January, President Cardoso has been a fighter for democracy throughout his life. He opposed the forces of authoritarianism at great personal risk to himself. More recently, he led the battle for economic reform during his years as Finance Minister, to reduce inflation, establish growth, and help Brazil fulfill the tremendous promise of its people and its land.

Today the President told me about his economic and constitution reform efforts, which are essential to placing Brazil on the path of sustainable development. I have every confidence in the President's ability to strengthen Brazilian democracy and to advance the visionary economic reforms he began as Finance Minister.

Brazil played a key role in forging the historic agreement at last year's Summit of the Americas. Today, President Cardoso and I discussed how we could build on that success. We also discussed bilateral trade issues, and we reaffirmed our commitments to open our markets to each other's products. With 160 million consumers, Brazil is one of today's biggest emerging markets, and it offers great opportunity for Americans.

We know that one of the ways we will do this is to realize our common commitment to achieve a free trade area of the Americas by the year 2005. We have instructed Ambassador Kantor and Foreign Minister Lampreia to review trade relations between our nations, as well as those between the NAFTA and the MERCOSUR countries, to consider ways to expand the flow of goods and capital between our nations. One step will be the first meeting this June of the United States-Brazil Business Development Council, which will bring together private sector leaders to increase investment and trade in both our nations.

On security issues, we had a very good discussion about the need to stand firm together against terrorism. We reviewed the effort by the Rio Protocol Guarantors to find a lasting solution to the conflict between Peru and Ecuador over their borders. Progress has been made in implementing a ceasefire, now we must find an enduring settlement. I congratulate, again, President Cardoso on his outstanding leadership in helping to resolve this conflict. And the United States has been proud to have Americans working with Brazilians there to try to make sure we bring the conflict to a satisfactory conclusion.

Let me say that, finally, we also reviewed our common efforts against narcotics and money laundering. We agreed to begin a dialog on protecting the environment. U.S. aid funds will be increased this year to try to assist that effort in Brazil. And our governments will exchange ideas on reforming international financial institutions to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

I must say, I was especially impressed by the ideas that President Cardoso and the members of his administration have shared with us on the changes we need to make in the international institutions so that we can get the benefit of the globally integrated markets that we all want to benefit from without having too much instability undermine the march to progress.

With our two great nations cooperating as never before, we stand at a moment of unparalleled opportunity. We must now seize it, and we will seize it. We will promote democracy. We will advance prosperity. We will do it together. In the months and years ahead, I look forward to working with President Cardoso to forge an even stronger partnership between our nations and our peoples. We should do it. It is in our interest to do it, and it is the right thing for our hemisphere and for the world to do it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

President Cardoso. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it was a great honor to be received by President Bill Clinton today. I know that this is a day of grief for this country, and I take this opportunity to extend to all Americans the solidarity of the Brazilian people. To you, President Clinton, I convey a personal message of support and encour-

agement. Mr. President, I repeat what I said this morning: In my view, this terrorist act affects not only America, it affects all of us who believe in peace and democracy and in freedom for all.

During our meeting, I had a chance to express to you my personal friendship and the admiration that Brazil has for his permanent commitment to the cause of peace, prosperity, and democracy.

I had the privilege of meeting President Clinton during the Miami summit, his initiative that he revealed his statesmanship and his vision of a better future for the Americas.

Today, as we discussed the prospects for our hemisphere, I had the chance to assure him that the same spirit of cooperation that guided my country during the works of the summit will keep guiding us in implementing of its results.

I had also the chance to bring to the American people the message of a country that went through deep transformations and that today presents itself to the world as a solid democracy, a strong economy, and a vigorous and free society. This new country is a natural partner of the U.S., and I stressed to President Clinton that the time is right for the design of a new affirmative agenda that will bring our two countries even closer together.

And I must say that it was really highly impressive by the kind words by President Clinton and by the spirit in our discussions. We have so many values in common. We have a similar political will. We have the support of our people to work together in reaffirming our commitment to reforms, to bring to our countries better conditions of life, and to go ahead with democracy.

I would like to add, Mr. President, that Brazil will support also the effort under the umbrella of the Organization of American States toward democracy and the specific program you referred to, and that Brazil will be always open in discussing the international financial issues, and Brazil is ready to assume more responsibilities at the world level in order to go ahead with the programs of peacekeeping and to do the best of our effort to really keep a world of peace.

Already in this context of this new agenda, Ambassador Lampreia, as you said, and Am-

bassador Kantor are being instructed to prepare a study of trade relations between Brazil and the United States with the objective of improving the flow of goods, services, and capital between our countries. In this same area, we agreed that the first meeting of the Brazil-U.S. Business Development Council shall take place in Denver this June, co-chaired by Ambassador Lampreia and by Secretary Brown, in bringing together private sector representatives. I am confident that this first meeting will be a very important opportunity to increase even further the economic relations between our two countries.

In the discussion of the main themes of the international agenda, I expressed to President Clinton my view that the same democratic values that had proven its strength with the end of cold war should now guide us in the effort of building a new international order. Democracy should be the cornerstone, not only inside each society but also among nations. This is the guideline that Brazil will follow in the meetings in which the revision of the San Francisco Charter will be discussed.

I also had the chance to express to President Clinton our long-standing commitment to the cause of nonproliferation and peace. This commitment has a very concrete translation in our decision to ratify and fully implement the Tlatelolco Agreement, and also in the creation of the Brazilian Space Agency. In our commitment by the executive branch to abide by the MTCR guidelines in the approval of the Quadrapartheid Nuclear Safeguards Agreement.

The very positive working meeting that I had the privilege to hold this morning with President Clinton is only a first step taken toward the strengthening of a new relationship that built upon a solid base of shared values will be decisive to make real the dream of a prosperous, fair, and free hemisphere for all of us.

Thank you very much.

President Clinton. Thank you.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Oklahoma City Bombing

Q. Mr. President, the bombing in Oklahoma City has left many Americans wondering if it can happen in the Nation's heartland,

can it happen in their hometown. What can you say to calm these fears? And in particular, what can you say to the Nation's children, who have been terrified by seeing other children killed?

President Clinton. I would say, first of all, that we are working very hard to strengthen the ability of the United States to resist acts of terror. We have increased our efforts in law enforcement, through the FBI and the CIA. We have increased our ability to cut off money used for such purposes. We have increased our capacity to track the materials that can be used to destroy people. I have sent legislation to the Congress, as you know, that would increase this capacity even further. I have done everything I could and our administration has to bring home suspected terrorists for trial from Pakistan, from Egypt, from the Philippines, from elsewhere. We are moving aggressively. Today I have ordered new steps to be taken to secure Federal facilities throughout the United States.

I would say to the children of this country, what happened was a bad thing, an evil thing, but we will find the people who did it, and we will bring them to justice. This is a law-abiding country. And neither the leaders nor the citizens of this country will permit it to be paralyzed by this kind of behavior.

Mexican Financial Crisis

Q. I'd like to address this question to both President Cardoso and President Clinton. You both mentioned today the spirit of Miami, the economic integration of the Americas. Do you believe it's still possible after the collapse of Mexico?

President Cardoso. Should I answer in Portuguese or English? I will answer in Portuguese because it could be immediately transmitted to Brazil.

[At this point, President Cardoso answered the question in Portuguese.]

If you would like, I can make a very brief summary. I said that I believe that what happened with Mexico is not an obstacle to go ahead with the Miami spirit. The Miami spirit was a result of a long history of good relationship among our peoples. And we believe that the immediate reaction, patronized by President Clinton and then the international

support to Mexico, was a good example of the necessity of still more alive spirit like the Miami summit did in order to solve problems and crises which can occur from time to time, but together, we will solve all these crises much more rapidly and much more energetically than alone.

President Clinton. I agree with that. I believe that, first of all, that the problem in Mexico has caused severe problems for the people of Mexico. It has also presented challenges to Brazil, to Argentina, indeed, to the United States. But look at the long run. The countries of our hemisphere are moving toward democracy, toward openness, toward free competition. The more we work together, the less likely it is that we will have future problems like we had in Mexico.

So, if anything, if there is any lesson to be drawn here, it is that we must work more urgently in these directions and more urgently to be strong together so that these events will not have the kind of shocking impact they had in Mexico.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Oklahoma City Bombing

Q. Mr. President, despite the horror of it all and the assumptions that may or may not be true, don't you think that it's time now to warn against hatred and violence against Middle Eastern stereotypes, just in case, since we do have strong laws in this country, I believe, against terrorism?

President Clinton. I would like to make, if I might, two comments with regard to that. Number one, I ask the American people not to jump to any conclusions. We have two missions now. One is search and rescue—search and rescue: We had a miraculous recovery of a teenage girl just hours ago, and we have six special teams from FEMA that will be on the ground today to continue this. The second is investigate. We have 200—200 FBI agents on the scene and hundreds of other people all across America putting their best efforts behind this. Let us not jump to conclusions.

Then I would say, in response to your question, there were three Arab-American organizations which today condemned what was done. This is not a question of anybody's

country of origin. This is not a question of anybody's religion. This was murder. This was evil. This was wrong. Human beings everywhere, all over the world, will condemn this out of their own religious convictions. And we should not stereotype anybody.

What we need to do is to find out who did this and punish them harshly. That's what we need to do. The American people should know that the best investigators in the world are working to find the truth. Let us support search and rescue and investigation and deal with the facts as we find them.

Bretton Woods Institutions

Q. I'd like to direct my question to both Presidents. After the Mexican crisis, both governments, Brazil and the United States, talked about the need for equipping international financial institutions of means to react in those circumstances. I would like to know what you have discussed in that regard. And to President Clinton, since the United States and the G-7 countries seems to continue to be in no position to increase of capital of the IMF, how can the G-7 countries achieve that objective without providing the money to the institution?

President Cardoso. Well, in fact—have discussed a little, that point, and it seems to us, I would say, that the time is coming to take some important decision in that area. It's not easy. You know, the Bretton Woods institutions are now approaching the 50th anniversary. So it's time to implement some changes. We are discussing these changes. I had some ideas. I presented to President Clinton these ideas which are not, you know, unexpected ideas. Everybody knows that it is important to—maybe to give more leverage to the IMF to act more promptly and to solve these emergency problems. I'm convinced that the G-7 will take the issue, and I am waiting for additional initiatives, and Brazil is—will be ready to cooperate in these kind of initiatives.

President Clinton. Let me say, I strongly believe that there must be some changes. And I urged the G-7 countries last year, when we met in Italy, to devote this year's meeting to reviewing the adequacy of the international financial institutions to meet

the challenges of the present global economy.

Furthermore, if we expect the IMF and the World Bank to tell countries, "Look you must reform your economy; you must even be prepared to have the hard times that discipline sometimes brings in the short run to help prosperity in the long run," then surely we must have some capacity to cushion the same countries that are prepared to make those sacrifices against unforeseen and dramatic adverse changes that the underlying economic circumstances do not warrant. So we are looking into that.

But I think that it is important for me as President of the United States not to commit myself at this early juncture to specific reforms until after I have a chance to consult with all the other countries with whom we should work, not just the G-7 countries but the emerging economies, the powerful countries of the future, like Brazil, who lived through this system and have very good ideas about how to change it.

Yes, Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Oklahoma City Bombing

Q. Two things, sir. First, how concerned are you that this incident in Oklahoma will be seen by those who feel that the United States should not have the kind of far-flung diplomatic and military undertakings that it does, that this is the kind of thing that happens when a nation, as some would say, meddles in the affairs of others? And second, if you know anything about it, sir, there's a wire service report that the British Interior Ministry says that a possible suspect in this case is—is being, or has been returned to the United States.

Thank you.

President Clinton. First, let me say, I would hope the American people would draw exactly the opposite conclusion from this. Our future lies in an open society, a free economy, and the free interchange of people of ideas and goods. In that kind of world, we cannot withdraw from the world, nor can we hide.

Look what happened in Argentina. No one thinks the Argentines are out there meddling in the affairs of people throughout the world. No great country can hide. We have to stand

up, fight this kind of madness, and take appropriate steps.

Moreover, I will say again, we do not know who the perpetrator is. Technology gives power to people to do this sort of thing. Look at what happened in Japan, where there was no outside influence, but a radical group within Japan, able to take a little vial of gas and kill large numbers of people, this having happened twice now.

So the lesson for my fellow citizens should be, we're going to stand with freedom-loving people throughout the world, like President Cardoso, who despise this sort of evil, and we're going to stamp it out. And we're going to protect our people.

Now as to the second question. Let me say again, I was briefed last night at midnight, I was briefed this morning, early in the morning. I know what the status of our efforts are. They are intense and they are comprehensive. But I do not believe we should be commenting on an ongoing investigation. And at the appropriate time, the Justice Department will say whatever it is that should be said.

I can tell the American people, they would be very proud of the efforts which have been made in this area since it occurred yesterday morning. They have been awesome, intense, comprehensive, and dogged. But I will not comment on the specific aspects of the investigation until the Justice Department determines it's appropriate to do.

Brazilian Patent Legislation

Q. I would like to direct the question to both Presidents. If the Brazilian Congress does not approve the intellectual property bill before the deadline for the USTR to start a new phase of investigation on Brazil, what course of action does each of you intend to take?

President Cardoso. Well, you know, the Brazilian Congress is a sovereign Congress. It can take the time it believes is necessary to discuss a bill. As you know, Brazilians know, the Brazilian Government has a clear idea and is exposing its own ideas to the Congress—is insisting on the necessity of a bill to protect intellectual rights. Also for Brazilians, we're having at that point in time, there are many Brazilians who are urging, you

know, the approval of this bill because they need to—to have their patents recognized across the world. And they have no possibility to ask the Brazilian Bureau to do it, because we don't have yet a law.

So I am convinced that the Congress will approve the bill as soon as possible. I'm expecting for this semester, the last vote in the Senate, and then back to the House—but the House has only one choice—assume that the Congress—that Senate added good things and then approve the amendments made by the Senate, or approve the law which has been already approved by the House.

So it's a matter of some—a couple of weeks or months, and this is important for Brazil, is not for United States. It is important for Brazil because we are integrating at the global level the economy, and we need to protect our own interests through this bill.

President Clinton. Well, as you know, we have certain laws in this country we have to follow. But I am absolutely convinced after this meeting today that the President wants to pass that legislation. And I agree with him that the main beneficiary of that legislation would not be the United States or other nations trading with Brazil. It would be Brazil.

It is important that everyone in Brazil understands you are rapidly becoming not only a very great economy but a very sophisticated one. A product manufactured by Brazil is now going to be part of the space shuttle. You need—if you're going to be a high-tech producer of sophisticated and diverse products, you must have a strong patent law. Yes, it will protect our intellectual property, but more importantly, it will enable you to continue to grow your economy.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Oklahoma City Bombing

Q. I know we're quite early on in the investigation on Oklahoma City, but Janet Reno has already said that the U.S. would seek the death penalty. I wondered if she did that with your concurrence. And also, if the United States should find that another country was behind this, should we expect military retaliation?

President Clinton. I must not and I must urge you not to speculate on who is guilty yet or what their connections are. That can-

not help the course of the investigation. Let us wait and see what the facts are.

In response to your first question, she did say that with my knowledge and support. Just a few—oh, maybe in a couple of hours after this incident occurred, after we reviewed all the things that we could do to work on the search and rescue mission, I asked specifically whether the crime bill we passed provided for capital punishment in cases like this. If this isn't an appropriate case for it, I don't think there ever would be one. And I strongly support what she said.

We'll take—take one last question—

[At this point, a question was asked in Portuguese, and no translation was provided.]

Brazilian Infrastructure

President Cardoso. The point raised is that Brazil needs something like \$70 billion in the coming 4 years just to enlarge its infrastructure, and we have passed a bill on—services concessions. By the way, I was the author of the bill when I was Senator. It took 4 years to approve the bill. And now, what is required is a set of rules by the executive branch in order to clarify how to do it.

This is, at this point in time, we have a draft for this Executive order, and it is a matter of weeks and the Brazilian Government will approve these rules. And of course, the Brazilian economy is open to foreign investors through this mechanism of concessions—concessions law, but also, we are going ahead with our privatization program. As I said yesterday, the Brazilian-American Chamber of Commerce, we are ready to ask for more foreign capital in several areas.

It depends in some areas, yet from our constitutional reform, and we are moving fast in that direction. I expect for the next month the approval of the constitutional amendments as sent to the Congress regarding economic order. As you know, President Clinton, constitutional amendments requires enormous debates at the Congress, and it takes time. To my view, what is going now on in Brazil is the Congress reacting very quickly because they are about to vote the first one of these amendments in a manner of maybe some days, and this will be a record. I am absolutely confident that the Brazilian

Congress will approve what is needed for the Brazilian economic improvement.

That's all.

Oklahoma City Bombing

President Clinton. I agree with that.

Let me—we have to conclude. I want to make sure that I have been very clear on the question, Rita, that you asked. You asked, well, what if we find out someone did it affiliated with another country. I don't want anyone to assume that we are accusing anybody or anything today. We do not know.

On the other hand, let me reiterate what I said yesterday. Whoever did it, we will find out, and there will be justice that will be swift and certain and severe. And there is no place to hide. Nobody can hide any place in this country; nobody can hide any place in this world, from the terrible consequences of what has been done. This was an attack on innocent children, on innocent victims, on the people there in Oklahoma City. But make no mistake about it, this was an attack on the United States, our way of life, and everything we believe in. So whoever did it, we will get to the bottom of it, and then we'll take the appropriate action.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 94th news conference began at 12:52 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Brazilian Foreign Minister Luiz Filipe Lampreia.

Proclamation 6786—Victims of the Oklahoma City Bombing

April 20, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On April 19, 1995, the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City was brutally bombed in an appalling act of cowardice. As a mark of respect for those killed in the bombing, I hereby order, by the authority vested in me as President of the United States of America by section 175 of title 36 of the United States Code, that the flag of the United States shall be flown at half-staff at the White House and upon all public

buildings and grounds, at all military posts and naval stations, and on all naval vessels of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions through Monday, April 24, 1995. I also direct that the flag shall be flown at half-staff for the same length of time at all United States embassies, legations, consular offices, and other facilities abroad, including all military facilities and naval vessels and stations.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:04 p.m., April 20, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 24.

Proclamation 6787—National D.A.R.E. Day, 1995

April 20, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) is America's largest and most effective drug-use prevention program. Reaching 25.5 million young people, from kindergarten through 12th grade, its precepts are taught in more than 250,000 classrooms in all 50 States and many other lands worldwide.

D.A.R.E. was designed to help prevent the substance abuse and violence that plague too many of our Nation's children. Teaching conflict resolution and anger management skills, providing accurate information about alcohol, drugs, and tobacco, and educating students about the consequences of their behavior, D.A.R.E. has served to increase self-esteem among our youth and give them the tools they need to resist destructive peer pressure.

Today, people everywhere recognize that empowering kids and teens with sound advice is important, but it is not enough. Par-

ents and teachers, counselors and concerned citizens all must play a role in encouraging our young people to lead safe, productive, drug-free lives. That is why D.A.R.E. is taught by veteran police officers, whose knowledge and skills have prepared them to understand the reality of the streets and the lives of children in need. D.A.R.E. demonstrates that, working together, communities have the power within themselves to keep the American Dream alive for all of us.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 20, 1995, as "National D.A.R.E. Day." I encourage parents, teachers, and children across the country to join in observing this day with appropriate programs and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:05 p.m., April 20, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 24.

Proclamation 6788—Jewish Heritage Week, 1995

April 20, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Throughout history and through times of profound adversity, the Jewish people have built their lives on the strength of family and the spirit of community. Millions have made a home in America—a Nation filled with opportunity and blessed with the miracle of freedom. And here, with hard work and dedication, the Jewish-American community has flourished.

Jewish citizens have made vital contributions to every sector of our society. From academia to the arts, from business to government, from the smallest towns to the largest

cities, Jewish Americans have infused our Nation with a powerful faith, a commitment to family and community, and a devotion to scholarship and self-improvement.

Judaism is a unique gift to this land that people of myriad faiths and cultures call home. The ancient commandment of *tzedakah*—charity—challenges us to embrace the duty of service to others. The Talmudic teachings of mercy and justice, and those who have sought to uphold these ideals, grace the pages of American history. We can draw strength and inspiration from the enduring lessons of Judaism, and it is entirely fitting that we honor the great traditions of its followers.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 30 through May 7, 1995, as “Jewish Heritage Week.” I call upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:06 p.m., April 20, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 24.

**Memorandum on Employees
Affected by the Oklahoma City
Bombing**

April 20, 1995

*Memorandum for the Heads of Executive
Departments and Agencies*

Subject: Excused Absence for Employees
Affected by the Bombing of the Federal
Building in Oklahoma City

I am deeply saddened by the loss of life and suffering caused by the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Okla-

homa City. I convey my deepest sympathy and heartfelt sorrow to our fellow Americans and their families who have been affected by this senseless act of violence. Many parts of the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this tragedy.

As part of this effort, I ask the heads of executive departments and agencies having Federal civilian employees in the Oklahoma City area to excuse from duty, without charge to leave or loss of pay, any such employee who is prevented from reporting to work or faced with a personal emergency because of the bombing and who can be spared from his or her usual responsibilities. This policy should also be applied to any employee who is needed for emergency law enforcement, relief, or recovery efforts authorized by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction.

Workers' compensation benefits are available in the case of Federal employees who were injured or killed in the bombing. The Department of Labor has sent a team of workers' compensation specialists to Oklahoma City to provide direct assistance to affected employees and their families.

William J. Clinton

**Remarks at a State Dinner Honoring
President Cardoso of Brazil**

April 20, 1995

Mr. President, Mrs. Cardoso, members of the Brazilian delegation, to all of our distinguished guests, Hillary and I are delighted to welcome you to the White House this evening.

Mr. President, I learned many things about you today. But one thing sort of surprised me: I learned that as a young man you were drawn to a life of the cloth. The reason I learned that and found it surprising was my grandmother told me that I would make a good minister if I were just a little better boy—[laughter]—and failing that, that I should go into politics. [Laughter]

But I think for a long time your family and friends believe you were more likely to wear a Cardinal's red hat than a President's sash. Well, you embraced politics, and now you lead your great nation. But I can't help

wondering whether after 4 months in office, after spending 2,880 hours dealing with Congress and fielding questions from the media, whether you ever wonder if you made the right choice. [Laughter]

Let me say from the point of view of the people of the United States, you clearly made the right choice. And it is obvious to all of us that your faith has remained a powerful part of your life. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain how you have endured arrest, blacklisting, and exile without giving in to despair; difficult to explain that although the enemies of democracy forced you to listen to your friends being tortured, and later bombed the office where you worked, you never wavered from the ideals of tolerance and openness.

Those ideals animate your leadership in Brazil today and your quest for social justice for all the people whom you proudly represent. And you have added to them an academic's expertise in policy and economics, which I am pleased to note, you have refined by teaching at some of our finest universities. We have all been impressed by the results you have achieved, especially the success of your "Real Plan."

Mr. President, I have been very pleased for the opportunity to continue the personal conversation we began in Miami last year at the Summit of the Americas. The warm and productive relationship that we have established mirrors the relationship that is growing closer every day between our two countries. We have common interests, bringing free trade to the Americas, promoting sustainable development throughout our hemisphere, keeping peace around the world. And that relationship is more important than ever.

I know from our discussions that we both believe Brazil and the United States have an opportunity, indeed an obligation, to be partners for progress in the Americas for all the years ahead. Today we have taken that partnership to a new level.

Let me also say, Mr. President, you know that you have come here, along with your wife and your fine delegation, at a very difficult time for our country. And all the American people have been profoundly impressed and grateful by your expressions of condolence and sympathy and your assertion that

we are all partners in the struggle against evil and inhumanity. For that we are especially grateful, and we will never forget it.

So I ask all of you to stand and raise your glasses in a toast to President and Mrs. Cardoso and to the people of Brazil.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:25 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Remarks on the Oklahoma City Bombing and an Exchange With Reporters

April 21, 1995

The President. I wanted to make a couple of points. First of all, I was briefed late last evening by the Attorney General on the status of the investigation, and I am well satisfied with the efforts that are being made, the progress that's being made. I would just ask that you and the American people not rush to any conclusions unsupported by known evidence and that we give the investigators the space they need to do their job. They are working hard; they are moving ahead.

The second thing I'd like to say is that Hillary and I have decided to go to Oklahoma City on Sunday to be a part of the memorial service and to be with the families of the victims and the people of Oklahoma City. I think all America will be there in spirit and is there today, and I have determined that I should also declare Sunday a national day of mourning for the victims there and to ask people in their places of worship and in their homes all across America to pray for the people there and for the community.

The final thing I'd like to say is just a brief message to the children of this country. I have been very concerned with how the children in Oklahoma City and, indeed, the children throughout America must be reacting to a horror of this magnitude. And my message to the children is that this was an evil thing and the people who did it were terribly, horribly wrong. We will catch them, and we will punish them.

But the children of America need to know that almost all the adults in this country are good people who love their children and love other children, and we're going to get through this—we're going to get through

this. I don't want our children to believe something terrible about life, and the future, and grown-ups in general because of this awful thing. Most adults are good people who want to protect our children in their childhood, and we are going to get through this.

Q. Mr. President, do you know of any progress in the investigation?

The President. You know I'm not going to comment. I'm letting the Justice Department announce progress. I don't think that it's appropriate for me to say anything, except I can tell you that I know what they've done and the American people would be very pleased and very impressed by the work they are doing. But this is a big issue, and we don't want to undermine their ability to work by anything that is said or by jumping to unwarranted conclusions.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House prior to his departure for Havre de Grace, MD.

Remarks on the 25th Anniversary of Earth Day in Havre de Grace, Maryland

April 21, 1995

Thank you so much. First let me say to all of you how glad we are to be here. I know a lot of you have been here since very early this morning, and you've had a little rain coming out of the sky. You might have gotten a little more of the environment than you bargained for today. [*Laughter*] But I'm glad to see you all here bright-eyed, clear-eyed, and committed to preserving America's natural environment.

I want to thank Governor Glendening and Senators Mikulski and Sarbanes, Congressman Gilchrest, and the other State officials who are here, your mayor, and so many others for everything that they have done. I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to the man who was responsible for this wonderful walkway we came down, Bob Lee and all the rest of you who worked on that. It's a great thing. I also want to thank the AmeriCorps volunteers who have done so much—[*applause*—who have done so much to help to keep the Chesapeake clean. And finally let me say a special word of thanks

to Mary Rosso. Didn't she do a good job up here—just like she was—[*applause*—not only for the speech that she gave but for the work that she did that brought her to this place today.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to do one other thing before I get into the remarks that I came to make today. You know that this is the 25th anniversary of Earth Day. Twenty-five years ago, Earth Day was an American celebration: Americans of both political parties; Americans of all races and ethnic backgrounds, Americans from all regions of the country; Americans who were rich, poor, and middle class; Americans just got together to reaffirm their commitment to preserving our natural environment; Americans who lived in the city and were worried about city environmental problems; and Americans who lived in places like this—people like me—who were interested in going to places like the Duck Decoy Museum, knew that if they wanted the ducks to fly in Arkansas and Maryland in duck season, we'd better clean the environment up. It was an American experience. We joined together to save the natural beauty and all the resources that God has given us and to pass it on to our children and grandchildren.

For a quarter of a century now, Americans have stood as one, to say no to dirty air, toxic food, poison water, and yes, to leaving a land to our children as unspoiled as their hopes. This Earth Day may be the most important Earth Day since the beginning because there is such a great debate going on now that threatens to break apart the bipartisan alliance to save this country.

And before I get into that, I want to ask a man to come up here who was mentioned by Vice President Gore, who started this whole Earth Day, and who sponsored a lot of the most important environmental legislation of our time, Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. I'd like to ask him to come here. After—give him a hand. [*Applause*]

After Gaylord Nelson left the United States Senate, he went on to a distinguished career as head of the Wilderness Society and devoted the rest of his working life directly to our environment. And today on this 25th anniversary of Earth Day, I decided the best way I could celebrate this and try again to

call for this American spirit of dedication to our environment is to award to Gaylord Nelson our Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

I can't help noting that in 1789 the Continental Congress almost made Havre de Grace our Nation's capital. Now that I'm here, I see why it was a contender. And on the bad days in Washington, if it's all the same to you, I may just come back here and set up shop.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you ever doubt what we can do together to preserve our heritage, all you have to do is look at this bay. The beauty you see is God-given, but it was defended and rescued by human beings. Not long ago the Chesapeake was a mess. Garbage floated on it; shellfish were unsafe to eat. Now, I know there's still a lot more to do, but you know the Bay is coming back because it overcame all that divided them to save their common heritage. People from Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia all joined together with a Federal effort as well. Citizens of all kinds from both political parties, watermen, farmers, businesspeople, environmental groups, they couldn't have done it without the bipartisan lines of defense sparked by the first Earth Day, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, all forged by Democrats and Republicans, by Presidents and Congresses working together.

Twenty-five years ago and more, we once had a river catch on fire. Lead was released into the air without a second thought. Our national bird was on the verge of extinction. Today we don't routinely dump sewage in our water anymore. We know better. Our children aren't dying from lead poisoning, and the Bald Eagle soars again all across America.

But what we're doing is more than about natural beauty. It also affects our health as well. A recent study by the Harvard School of Public Health found that air pollution raised the risk of premature death by 15 or more percent.

Now, in this atmosphere of debate over environmental issues today, we all know that the particular solutions that were adopted 25 years ago aren't necessarily the right detailed

program for today or for the next 25 years. But the old habit of putting American progress against nature is as outdated as the old belief that heavy top-down Government can solve all of our problems.

So as we say, well, should we reform the way we do things, let's not forget there is a right way and a wrong way to reform our approach to preserving our environment and protecting the public health. It would be crazy to throw the gains we have made in health and safety away, or to forget the lessons of the last 25 years. But that is just exactly what some of the proposed legislation in the United States Congress would do, and you must be clear about it.

Can this new Congress with these proposed bills prove that our air will be clean under the laws that have been proposed? Can they prove our water will be free of deadly bacteria? Can they prove our meat will be untainted? Bills passed in the House effectively hold up all regulations for 2 years. Should we wait that long for fresher air, purer water, safer food?

Instead of success stories like the Chesapeake, what if we face what happened in Milwaukee? In April of 1993, the citizens of Milwaukee drank the city's water not knowing it had been contaminated by a deadly bacteria. A hundred people died. Hundreds more fell ill. Thousands more fell ill. The last casualty of that incident occurred just a few days ago when a child died from an infection, just a few days ago.

For more than a week, the people of Milwaukee were terrified to brush their teeth, make coffee, use ice cubes, even wash their clothes in the city's water supply. If you want to know how bad it was, you can ask Robert and Astrid Morris who are here, or Susan Mudd, who along with her husband, Mayor John Norquist of Milwaukee, dealt with the terrible problems that faced all people of that city and reached into their own family. They were all in Milwaukee. Their loved ones suffered. They are here today. I'd like them to be recognized. They're over there. Raise your hands, and let's give them a hand. *[Applause]*

That's just one example of our continuing challenge on the health front. Two years ago more than 400 people got horribly sick from eating hamburgers that contained the deadly

E. coli bacteria. Children died. How could it happen? Well, at the time, inspectors from the Department of Agriculture merely looked, touched, and smelled meat and poultry to determine whether it was contaminated. Under the leadership of our then-Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Espy, we moved aggressively to step up inspections, and we proposed new regulations to use high-tech devices to really check the meat for its purity so that we'll be able to stop diseases that can infect our food.

But listen to this: The House of Representatives passed legislation that would handcuff our ability to address these two problems and many others as well. The House bill would hold up for a year regulations to protect people from the *E. coli* bacteria or from the microbial in the Milwaukee water. In fact, there were specific, separate votes on both those things where our people said, "Well, at least let's protect Milwaukee and that problem." "Well, at least, let's deal with the *E. coli* problem." Surely we don't need to wait this long to put in these standards. And they said, "No, we don't need to do this."

Now, folks, in the politically attractive name of deregulation—who can be against that—they have proposed a moratorium on all efforts to protect public health and safety, even these efforts, when we know there is a danger and we know what to do about it. This would stop good regulations, bad regulations, all regulations. They would block the safeguards that we have proposed to see that Milwaukee never happens again. They would block our efforts to make sure we don't expose anymore children anywhere by accident to the tainted meat with *E. coli* bacteria. We must not let this happen. And I will not let it happen.

Let me give you another example of what's going on. Should Government examine the cost and benefits of what it does before it moves? Of course. Don't you do that in your own life? Of course, you do. And I would support a reasonable bipartisan bill that says we ought to pay more careful attention to the cost and benefits of what we do. But under the so-called "risk legislation" pending in the Congress, every agency of our Government would have to go through an expensive

and time-consuming process every time they want to move a muscle.

One line in this bill—I want to say this again—one line in this proposed legislation overrides every health and safety standards on the books. It says rather than our children's health, money will always be the bottom line.

This bill would let lawyers and special interests tie up the Government forever in lawsuits and petitions. The people proposing this bill after railing for years and years and years about how we have too many lawsuits and too much bureaucracy have constructed a bill designed to give relief to every lawyer in the country that wants to get into a mindless legal challenge and designed to construct gridlock and to make sure it gets into the court and lasts forever as long as it's about an environmental regulation. It would literally give polluters control over the regulations that affect them. It would lead to more bureaucracy, more lawsuits, but a whole lot less protection of the public health. And it should be defeated.

There is another bill in the House—it passed the House—called the so-called "takings bill". And it has a very politically attractive purpose, to prevent the Government from taking property away from citizens without paying them for it. Well, that's already provided for in the Constitution. But it sure sounds good, doesn't it? You wouldn't like it if the Government showed up tomorrow on your front step and took your home away. And you'd expect even if it were an emergency and had to be done, to be paid for it. That's not what this is about. You're protected from that already. This is about making taxpayers pay polluters not to pollute. This is about making the Government pay out billions of dollars every time it acts to protect the public. It would bust the budget and benefit wealthy landowners at the expense of ordinary Americans.

This so-called "takings bill" has been on the ballot in 20 States. And every place it's been on the ballot, including some very conservative Republican States, the voters have voted against it. Well, the voters don't get to vote on the "takings legislation," so the President will vote for them, and the President will vote no.

Ladies and gentlemen, you might wonder who thought up these bills. Well, the lobbyists for the big companies thought up these bills. And they were actually invited to sit down at the table and draft the bills and then explain them to the Congressmen who were supposed to be writing them.

Now, you know, lobbyists have always had an important role in the legislative process, and they always will. And all of us could be lobbyists at one time or another if something were going on in Congress or in the State legislature we didn't like or that we did like. But in my lifetime, nothing like this has ever happened. I mean, they're having meetings in which the lobbyists are writing the bills and explaining them to the Congressmen, who are then supposed to go explain why they're for them.

The lobbyists were given a room off the House floor to write speeches for the Congressmen explaining why they were supporting the bills that the lobbyists had written for them. When some Senators held a briefing on one of these bills recently, they invited the lobbyists to explain what they were for, since they had written it and the Senators hadn't quite got it down yet. [Laughter]

Now, I don't think that any party has a lock on purity. And I think that all politics is about compromise. But there has never in my lifetime been an example like this. And I don't think whether you're a Republican or a Democrat or a liberal or a conservative, I don't think you believe that that's the way your Federal Government ought to work when it comes to matters affecting the health and welfare of your children and the environmental future of the United States, and indeed our entire planet. I don't believe you believe that.

On this Earth Day let me pledge we will not allow lobbyists to rewrite our environmental laws in ways that benefit polluters and hurt our families, our children, and our future. Reform: yes. Modernize: you bet. But roll back health and safety? No. Let DDT into our food again? Not on your life. Create more tainted water or toxic waste, the kind Mary Rosso and Angela Pool from Gary, Indiana, who is also with us here today, the kind of things they are fighting? Never. No.

Say no, folks. Say no. Just say no to what they are doing.

I will support the right kind of change. I have spent 2 years working with the Vice President to do things people said couldn't be done. We have tried to improve the environment and advance the economy. He has proved with his reinventing Government initiative that you could reduce bureaucracy, shrink the size of the Federal Government, and improve the performance of the Federal Government so that people get more for their tax dollars. I support a bill in the Senate that is bipartisan that would give Congress 45 days to consider new regulations before they take effect. That is not an unreasonable amount of time. Government bureaucracies do make mistakes. Everybody can come up with some horror story they've had in their life. Do something reasonable like this. But to paralyze the ability of the Government of the United States to protect children from more Milwaukees and more *E. coli* hamburgers, no, no, no. Let's adopt a reasonable bipartisan bill.

Let me tell you something else we did that I hope you will support. Until recently, we discovered that many small businesses were literally afraid to come to the Environmental Protection Agency for help in cleaning up a problem because they thought they would be fined. They thought they'd go through a bureaucratic nightmare, and so they didn't come. And so under the leadership of Carol Browner, the EPA has changed its policy. Now, if a small business comes to the EPA in good faith for advice on an environmental problem, they will be given 180 days, 6 months, to fight it with—to solve it without being fined. That way they can spend the money repairing their businesses and repairing the Earth, not fighting with regulators.

The Vice President also said that the EPA was going to cut its paperwork burdens on Americans by 25 percent. Twenty million hours a year will be given by the Government back to the private citizens of the United States to do what they want. That's more important to a lot of people than money. We are giving 20 million hours from the Government back to the people of the United States to do what they want. I am all for making Government less burdensome. It shouldn't

take a forest full of paper to protect the environment. No telling how many trees we're going to keep up by cutting the paperwork burden of the EPA. But to cut the mission of the EPA to protect the environment and the future, no. Let's change in the right way, not the wrong way.

My fellow Americans, in the next 10 years as we move toward the 21st century, indeed, in the lives of all the children here present throughout their lives, I predict to you we will become more concerned with environmental issues, not less concerned. We will have to deal with the shortage of clean water, with global climate change, with the unfair environmental burdens that are placed on poor communities in America, with the political problems of uncontrollable immigration that are sparked all around the world in part because of environmental degradation. Do you remember how just a few months ago the waters were full of Haitian boat people trying to get to the United States because of political oppression? One reason is nobody can make a living down there because they have ripped every tree off every spot of ground in the whole country. It is an environmental crisis as well as an economic crisis.

So as we restore democracy, we know democracy will not prevail, we know that the Haitian people will not be able to live in Haiti and raise their children there and make money there and not seek to come to the United States or somewhere else unless we can rebuild the environment. My fellow Americans, we must be more concerned with these issues, not less concerned with these issues. We cannot disarm our ability to deal with them. Our natural security must be seen as part of our national security.

Take a last look at this beautiful bay behind me. I'll never forget the first time I saw the Chesapeake, about 30 years ago now—a little more actually. Will your children's children see what we see now and what I saw then? Will there be water clean enough to swim in? Will there be a strong economy that is sustained by a sound environment? Believe me, if we degrade our American environment, we will depress our economy and lower our incomes and shrink our opportunities, not increase them.

It is our landscape, our culture, and our values together that make us Americans. Stewardship of our land is a major part of the stewardship of the American dream since the dream grew out of this very soil. Robert Frost wrote, "The land was ours before we were the land." This continent is our home, and we must preserve it for our children, their children, and all generations beyond.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:46 a.m. in the Park at Concord Lighthouse. In his remarks, he referred to Governor Parris Glendening of Maryland; Mayor Gunther Hirsh of Havre de Grace; Charles Lee (Bob Lee) Geddes, management assistant, Harford County Department of Parks and Recreation; and Mary Rosso, founder, Maryland Waste Coalition.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on the Oklahoma City Bombing

April 21, 1995

The President. Good afternoon. First let me say how very proud I am of the swift and decisive and determined work of law enforcement officials on this case throughout the country. I know every American is proud of them, too. Their continued vigilance makes me sure that we will solve this crime in its entirety and that justice will prevail.

Today I want to say a special word of thanks to the Justice Department, under the able leadership of the Attorney General, to Director Freeh and all the hundreds of people in the FBI who have worked on this case, to the men and women of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, to all the Federal authorities, and to all the State and local enforcement officials, especially those in Oklahoma who have been working on this case. And of course, I'd like to say a personal thanks, as I know all Americans would, to the Oklahoma lawman whose vigilance led to the initial arrest of the suspect.

As I said on Wednesday, justice for these killers will be certain, swift, and severe. We will find them. We will convict them. And we will seek the death penalty for them.

Finally, I know I speak for all Americans when once again I extend our deepest thanks

to the brave men and women who are still involved in the rescue teams. Let us not forget them. There is a lot of work for them still to do. It is difficult, and it is often heart-breaking now.

Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the people in Oklahoma City. And let me say again: You will overcome this moment of grief and horror. You will rebuild. And we will be there to work with you until the work is done.

Q. Mr. President, is there a sense now, sir, that this was not a foreign threat, that this was something from within our own borders?

The President. Let me say that I have never and the Justice Department has never said that it was a foreign threat. But the most important thing that you understand is that even though this is a positive development, this investigation has a lot of work still to be done in it, and therefore, it would be—it would be wrong to draw any conclusions. There have been lots of twists and turns in this investigation. But I would say to the American people, we should not assume, as I said yesterday, that we should not assume that any people from beyond our borders are involved in it. We should not assume anything, except what we know.

Q. Any idea about motive, Mr. President? Anything in terms of the one suspect who's been arrested—any feeling about what—where he was or who he was or what he was up to?

The President. I would defer, with the same comment that the Attorney General and Director Freeh had on that—we simply must not speculate on that at this time.

Q. Mr. President, will this prompt the United States—or the Government to take a new and a tougher look at the white supremacist groups, the hate groups, the militias? Is this going to trigger any kind of crack-down?

The President. Let me say that we need to finish this investigation now. We need to focus on this investigation. We need to finish this investigation. We need to finish the rescue. We then need to obviously examine anew, as we will over the next few days, the sufficiency of our efforts in the whole area of terrorism.

Maybe it would be helpful—let me just take a few moments to talk about what we have been doing for the last couple of years before the Oklahoma City incident, because I think it is apparent to any observant person that all civilized societies have to be on their guard against terrorism.

We have increased the counterterrorism budgets and resources of the FBI and the CIA. We arrested a major terrorist ring in New York before they could consummate their plans to blow up the U.N. and tunnels in New York City. We've retrieved terrorists who have fled abroad, as I said yesterday, from Pakistan, the Philippines, from Egypt, and elsewhere. We broke up a major terrorist ring before they could consummate their plans to blow up airplanes flying over the Pacific. We brought together all the various agencies of the Federal Government that would be involved in rescue and in response to a terrorist action and did a comprehensive practice earlier. And some of that work, I think, was seen in the very efficient way that they carried out their work at Oklahoma City.

And finally, let me say, there's been a lot of activity that the public does not see, most of which I should not comment on. But let me give you one example. There was one recent incident of which I was—or with which I was intimately familiar, which involved a quick and secret deployment of a major United States effort of FBI and FEMA and Public Health Service and Army personnel, because we had a tip of a possible terrorist incident, which, thank goodness, did not materialize. But we went to the place, and we were ready. We were ready to try to prevent it. And if it occurred, we were ready to respond.

So we have been on top of this from the beginning. Finally, let me say, I issued the Executive order, which gives us the ability to try to control funding more strictly. And I have sent counterterrorism legislation to the Hill, which I hope will be acted upon quickly when they return.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. Mr. President, does the way this is coming down—does this way this is coming down give Americans any reason to feel a little bit more secure that this particular group is not

going to carry out something else, or do you just not know yet?

The President. I think Americans can be secure that our country has able law enforcement officials, that we work together well, that we have prevented terrorist activities from occurring, that, obviously, every civilized society is at risk of this sort of thing. I cannot, I must not comment on any of the specific people involved in this investigation at this time.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN].

Q. Mr. President, is there anything that has come across your desk so far to suggest that this bombing in Oklahoma City could have been prevented, as other terrorist incidents that you were referring to were prevented? Was there a failure somewhere down the chain of command someplace that—a tip, a clue, a source, could have provided information leading to this explosion?

The President. I have no evidence to that effect at this time.

Gene [Gene Gibbons, Reuters].

Q. Mr. President, there has been a loud, constant drumbeat in this country in recent years: The Government is the enemy; the Government is bad. Given the way this case seems to be pointing, do you think that in any way contributed to what happened in Oklahoma City on Wednesday?

The President. I think it's important that we not speculate about the motives or the atmosphere or anything else until this investigation is complete. It can only—anything I say could only undermine the successful conclusion of this.

Q. Mr. President, you have been cautious about warning us and all Americans not to draw any conclusions over the past several days. Can you rule out a foreign tie to a domestic group, and can you in any way blame this incident on any kind of climate presently in this country?

The President. I cannot rule in or rule out anything. It would be inappropriate. The investigation has not been completed. And again, that's a variation of the question that was just asked. I cannot and I should not characterize this in terms of the climate or anything else at this time.

Let us do this investigation. Let the people get the work done. Let us follow every lead,

pursue every alley. Let's wrap this up so we can see it whole, and then there will be time for this kind of analysis. I understand why you want to do it. It's perfectly understandable and appropriate, but it's not ripe yet. We have to solve the heinous crime first.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:05 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement Announcing the Award of the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Gaylord Nelson

April 21, 1995

I am pleased to announce my intention to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to former Senator Gaylord Nelson, who as State Legislator, Governor, and Senator championed the protection of our natural resources. As we commemorate the 25th anniversary of Earth Day, his creation, it is fitting that we honor this great American's lifetime of public service.

In establishing Earth Day, Gaylord Nelson helped us to recognize that our fragile environment was increasingly at peril and that each of us could make a difference. His work has inspired all Americans to take responsibility for the planet's well-being and for our children's future.

I look forward to presenting the Medal to Senator Nelson.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 21, 1995.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Statement on Senator David Pryor's Decision Not To Seek Reelection

April 21, 1995

Throughout his career, David Pryor has been a champion of America's finest values. He is a fierce advocate for our children and the elderly and a ready voice for the cause of reason. From the State legislature and the

Governor's office in Arkansas to the U.S. Congress, he has served our country from the bottom of his heart and in the best possible way. His retirement from the Senate will be a loss felt by us all.

I know I can continue to count on David's exceptional counsel, both as a valued adviser and a trusted friend. I look forward to his continued active involvement in the business of our Nation.

Proclamation 6789—National Day of Mourning in Memory of Those Who Died in Oklahoma City
April 21, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we seek justice for the evil done in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, good and decent people everywhere mourn the loss of innocents. Our sons and daughters, parents and friends were stolen from us. Their families can never replace the gift of their laughter. Our Nation can never replace the spirit of their character. But even as we grieve, we resolve today in solemn promise that those on earth shall never be bowed by murderous cowards. This sin against humanity shall not go unpunished.

It has been said that, "In every child who is born, the potentiality of the whole human race is born again." We lost unimaginable potential this past week. And we will miss our loved ones dearly. But the children who died in this violence may yet lift up humanity. We do them no greater honor than by taking from their deaths the memory of their hopes, by carrying with us always their dreams, their kind and trusting ways. We redeem the value of their lives no further than by heeding the voices of children everywhere, who ask simply and invariably for peace and love.

We take comfort in knowing that all who perished are in God's hands.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby appoint Sunday, April 23, 1995, as a National Day of Mourning throughout the United States. I ask the American people assembled on that day in

their homes and places of worship to pay homage to the memory of those lost in the Oklahoma City tragedy and to pray for them and their community. I invite all those around the world who share our grief to join us in this solemn observance.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:46 a.m., April 24, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 25.

Proclamation 6790—National Volunteer Week, 1995
April 21, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Our ancestors built this Nation on the spirit of independence and the strength of community. Yesterday's Americans came together to raise a barn, till a farm, or teach a child to write. They came together to care for one another and to lift up their neighbors in need. For rich and poor, old and young, giving their talents to benefit the community was the most fundamental responsibility of American citizenship.

Through the years, this basic ideal has endured. Service remains the noblest quality of the American character. Our people still come together to build a house, plant a garden, or tutor a child. Elementary school students help older Americans in their daily lives. Seniors help struggling teenagers stay out of trouble. Countless dedicated citizens claim our country's challenges as their own. Their service sets a powerful example of leadership and compassion for each of us to follow.

As a partner in progress, government can expand and strengthen this great American legacy. AmeriCorps, the Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America now provide service opportunities for more than a million of our citizens. These initiatives enable us to

keep faith with the covenant of citizenship. This week, we celebrate the tens of millions of volunteers who give their time, their energy, and their hearts to making our world a better place.

We are indeed fortunate that, even as we face difficult problems in our streets, schools, homes, and communities, citizens are volunteering to help one another in numerous ways. Some spend a few hours every week. Others give entire days—even years—of their lives to service. Each makes a lasting contribution to the substance and the spirit of community in America. And each helps lead us into an ever brighter future.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 23 through April 29, 1995, as “National Volunteer Week.” I call upon all Americans to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities in expression of their commitment.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., April 24, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 25.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

April 16

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned from a week-end stay at Camp David, MD.

April 18

The President announced his intention to nominate Ira S. Shapiro for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Senior Counsel and Negotiator in the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

April 19

The President announced his intention to appoint Art Trujillo and Rick Reyes as members of the Advisory Council of the Border Environment Cooperation Commission established under the North American Free Trade Agreement.

April 20

The President announced his intention to nominate Larry C. Napper, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to Latvia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Lawrence Palmer Taylor, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to Estonia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Peter Tomsen, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to Armenia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Jenonne Walker to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic.

The President announced his intention to nominate R. Grant Smith, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to Tajikistan.

The President announced the appointment of Panamanian citizens Fernando Cardoze, Moises Mizrachi, Emmanuel Gonzales Revilla, and Jorge Ritter as members of the Board of the Panama Canal Commission.

April 21

In the morning, the President traveled to Havre de Grace, MD. Following his arrival, he met with individuals at the Duck Decoy Museum who are working to protect the environment.

In the afternoon, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The White House announced that the President met with U.S. Ambassador to Burundi Robert Krueger.

The President declared a major disaster exists in the State of Alabama and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding, February 15–20.

The President announced his intention to nominate Patrick Nickolas Theros, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service and class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar.

The President announced his intention to nominate A. Peter Burleigh, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service and class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka as well as to the Republic of Maldives.

The President announced his intention to appoint Frederick Calhoun James and Huel D. Perkins to the President's Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

The President announced his intention to appoint Helen Roth to the Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Aging.

The President announced his intention to reappoint the following members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation:

- Senator Dennis DeConcini;
- Jerry M. Hultin;
- James B. Nutter;
- Harriet Woods.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released April 18

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Announcement of the White House national campaign to protect the environment and create jobs

Released April 19

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by U.S. Ambassador to Turkey Marc Grossman, Senior Director of European Affairs, NSC, Alexander Vershbow, and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Richard Holbrooke on the visit of Prime Minister Ciller of Turkey

Transcript of a press briefing by Attorney General Janet Reno on the bombing in Oklahoma City, OK

Released April 20

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released April 21

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on presentation of the Presidential Citizens Medals to Zachary Fisher, Lt. Gen. Claude Kicklighter, and Maj. Gen. Adrian St. John

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with U.S. Ambassador to Burundi Robert Krueger

Acts Approved by the President

Approved April 17

H.R. 1345 / Public Law 104–8
District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995

Approved April 21

S. 178 / Public Law 104–9
CFTC Reauthorization Act of 1995